

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7591. A bill to limit the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation, the First Export-Import Bank of Washington, the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 392. Joint resolution making an appropriation for loans and relief in the flood-stricken areas of Mississippi and Alabama; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5812. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Kings County American Legion Welfare Committee, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging conference with the Administrator of the Works Progress Administration for the purpose of restoring recent cuts made in the Works Progress Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5813. Also, letter from the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, urging consideration of the views of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York on that part of the proposed Neutrality Act referring to American flagships; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5814. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of 44 citizens of Chester County, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5815. Also, petition of 197 citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5816. Also, petition of 44 citizens of the Chestnut Level Presbyterian Church, of Lancaster County, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose majesty is inscrutable and power incomparable, whose work is life, and whose love is grace: We bow the knee before Thee, for Thou art also our Father, of whom the whole family in Heaven and earth is named, beseeching Thee that Thou wouldst grant us, according to the riches of Thy glory, to be strengthened with might by Thy spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith; that we, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that we may be filled with all the fullness of God. And, as Thou dost indwell us, grant that we may do Thy will as it comes to us in the stream of incidents that bears us onward, and may it be our joy to find our inspiration in the fulfillment of the duties of this day. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 19, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Austin	Donahay	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lodge	Schwartz
Bankhead	Ellender	Lucas	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Lundeen	Sheppard
Barkley	George	McCarran	Shipstead
Billbo	Gerry	McKellar	Slattery
Borah	Gibson	McNary	Smathers
Bridges	Gillette	Maloney	Stewart
Brown	Green	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	White
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE LEIF ERICSON SOCIETY, CHICAGO

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Leif Ericson's Challenge to This Age," delivered by him on October 9, 1939, before the Leif Ericson Society of Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. HANES BEFORE BOND CLUB OF NEW YORK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. John W. Hanes, Under Secretary of the Treasury, before the Bond Club of New York at New York City on October 18, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT IN OREGON OF RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Oregon Voter of October 14, 1939, relating to the reciprocal-trade agreement with Canada, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT ON BUSINESS OF TRADE SECTIONS OF NEUTRALITY RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of California obtained the floor.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have read by the clerk a letter from Mr. Joseph Kohn, president of the Universal Dental Co., of Philadelphia, under date Philadelphia, October 19. It is a very short letter and will take but a moment to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNIVERSAL DENTAL CO.,
Philadelphia, October 19, 1939.
Hon. JAMES DAVIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The following is a quotation from the New York Times of October 19:

"As a means for further tightening the 'cash' requirements of the cash-and-carry section, the Senators agreed that an amendment should be inserted to put individuals and governments on

the same footing in the law. As presently framed, the trade sections of the neutrality resolution relate to transactions between American nationals and foreign governments or their agents. The amendment suggested today would create the presumption that any goods purchased by a national of another country is purchased for the government of that country."

I respectfully call your attention to the injurious effects on business if such an amendment were passed. In our own particular case, we have been doing business with a British firm for the last 17 years and during that time our arrangements for settlement were on the basis of 120 days. If the amendment, as described in the above quotation, were passed, it would mean a complete disruption of our business relationship of the last 17 years and would create a hardship on our associates in England who undoubtedly would not be able to adjust their finances in such a manner so as to comply with the intent of this amendment. I therefore call your attention to the possible injurious effects that such an amendment may have on our business and I don't doubt that there are thousands of other firms in the United States who are in a similar position as ours and who would be gravely affected by such an amendment.

I personally am heartily in favor of the cash-and-carry principle and the repeal of the embargo as it affects relations between individuals and agencies of governments, but from my understanding it was never the intent that the act should interfere with the ordinary commercial relationships between individuals of the United States and those of belligerent countries.

Very truly yours,

UNIVERSAL DENTAL CO.,
JOSEPH KOHN, President.

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, in the midst of "excursions" and "alarms," with blood pressure mounting, it is difficult to write a just neutrality act, or fairly to frame any measure which may affect one side or the other of belligerents. In the present instance it is particularly so, for every instinct aligns us with the cause of one and against the other. I thought all this was indubitably established by the actions and remarks of our own people until I heard this debate in the Senate. I now discover that the intent was harbored by but a few to repeal the embargo so that Great Britain and France would be favored, and Germany hamstrung. All these asseverations of favoring one side, we now learn, are mere perfervid oratory. So let us conclude that everybody is seeking how best to do justice, that there is no partiality in this debate except in a few instances, and all on the highest plane, as they raise their hands aloft, are trying to do their utmost for all sides, and to hold the scales equally.

These truths are self-evident in this discussion:

First. That the repeal of the embargo favors the Allies.

Second. That such repeal accomplished after the beginning of the war would be unneutral.

In approaching this question I have attempted to do so in judicial fashion. I think all who occupy our position should do likewise. I have but one approach to this subject, one guide, and that is the welfare of the United States of America. I grant the urge of emotions, and it would be only a stupid man who would not acknowledge the effect of them. But I insist on justice and truth in determining a policy such as is presented by this joint resolution. I insist that we must guard ourselves against yielding too much to emotion, and the refusal to dilute our emotions with reason.

We all ought to be upon the same basis in the determination of this controversy. We all ought to rise superior to any of those considerations which actuate us now and then. No matter whether an election be near or whether it be far off, we all ought to feel that we are deciding a question of life and death, perhaps, for our country in accordance with the law and the facts. We all ought to feel that there is no man on earth, no matter who he may be, who can compel us to do that which is wrong in this particular matter. No matter how comfortable it may be, however glorious it may be to sit in the sunlight that beats about a throne, we all ought to be willing to decide this question, not upon that part, not upon that influence, no man's say-so, no man's influence, but we ought to decide it in favor of our country and our children.

This is what I have endeavored to do. I beg you, my fellow Senators, that you do likewise. Now is the time for assertion of that which is highest and best in us. Now is the time

for us to rise superior to any question of personal influence or of personal consequence and do the right thing, the just thing, not to France, not to England—it might be thought, sometimes, to hear people talk, that this was a Parliament of Great Britain—not to Germany, but to the United States of America. That is what I appeal for today—that we may give to the United States of America the best that is in us; that no man shall coerce us, no man shall say how we shall vote or how we shall not vote; none shall be actuated in this forum except by conscience. If upon that basis we will determine this question, then no man can ask more.

As the Democratic leader said yesterday, I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. There is but one mode in which I can decide this question, and that is in the pure light of reason and the steady, undimmed light of justice. Twenty years ago we fought a great war, and our gradual entry into it in many ways parallels the contest that is on us today. I shall not labor the causes of the great World War. Suffice it to say that we were gradually eased into that war in 1917; and the propaganda, cunningly written and disseminated, that seemed to justify our action, is not unlike that we meet today.

Some reference was made yesterday to catch phrases. I quite agree that the problem is too solemn for any catch phrases to have aught to do with it; but I would have the Senate remember the many that were used to induce us to fight in 1917. Do you not recall, Mr. President, the many that were then used to induce us to fight? Do you not recall how we were going to make the world "safe for democracy"?—how we fought for the preservation of civilization, how the rights of minorities we were ever to cherish and protect, and how our brethren in arms, our allies, were fighting an idealistic war to prevent the subjugation of the peoples of the earth? We fought a bloody war to make the world "safe for democracy," and at the end of it there were fewer democracies in the world, and hundreds of thousands of people had been enslaved under dictatorships. The propaganda of the last war reads like ghoulish humor. The epithets, the worst of which was "Hun," and the idealism concerning democracy, now seem incredibly childish.

Have we learned nothing by that war? Have not our dead and maimed taught us anything? Are we deaf to every lesson that may be learned from experience, and experience dearly paid for? Have our immense war debts, a large part incurred in lending our money for rehabilitation, with their contemptuous repudiation and default, contained no lesson for us? Have the incredible burdens of our people, the monstrous debt, the aftermath economically, been forgotten?

Oh, Members of the United States Senate who glibly talk about another foreign war, do you not realize in common with me, what another war will mean for the country that you love and that I love? I am so old now that no longer is ambition in my blood. I am so old now that I have but one thought, and that is to serve the United States of America. Oh, can you not recall what the last war did for us under the influence of propaganda? Can you not realize that we have not yet recovered from the effects of that particular conflict? And if we should have another, I will not paint for you, I leave you to imagine, what the result would be.

So, my friends, I speak to you solemnly. I speak to you with all the emphasis I can command, because I believe we are on the brink of a precipice, and if we obey the commands that are issued to us, if we obey the commands of the British or the French Governments, we are likely to be forced over that precipice and finally find ourselves without any government, without any democracy, with nothing of any kind or character that we desire to cherish and preserve.

It is unfortunate that this question comes to us as a war question, upon which the fetid propaganda of war has its influence in arousing the prejudices of our people. Calm, deliberate judgment is necessary for the solution of our problem, and yet we are acting at a time of great stress, when the propaganda utilized by its masters has inflamed the minds of our people and distorted their judgment. An unhealthy and artificially stimulated war psychology is generated which

operates to distract the American people from their own affairs and their own problems.

A well-known writer, Mr. John T. Flynn, recently said in the Washington News:

Civic groups in particular find they have utterly lost the ear and the interest of the community.

Some of this is due to the inherent interest of the war itself. Some of it is due to the effort of propagandists to raise the fears of the American people into supposing that they are in some immediate danger.

Everybody was geared to protect himself from propaganda from Europe. But the propaganda has been pouring upon us from America, from the Government itself.

We have been told we are in an emergency. Then the President starts a spy scare and hunt. Then he announces that submarines are prowling off our coasts. Then he invokes the old Espionage Act. People are asked to adjourn politics. The result is they adjourn almost everything. And thus an unhealthy and artificially stimulated war psychology is generated which operates to distract the American people from their own affairs and their own problems.

This will be serious unless some power operates to calm the people. What power is there to compete against the Government's power to arouse and frighten them?

And in this atmosphere and this psychology we come to our task.

It is a pity that it is so. It should not be so in this country. But at this time, with all our people made jittery by the actions of the administration, we come to solve the greatest problem ever submitted for solution, save perhaps that presented to us at the time of the last World War.

If we have been lulled again into a false sense of security, and have forgotten the events of the last war, the American people have not. It may be necessary for us again to go through the same welter. It may be necessary for us, with the misrepresentative propaganda that is before us, to go through the same emotional strain of 20 years ago to learn the lesson of those days; but I feel sure the American people need no second baptism to awaken their recollection.

Since that war there have been many attempts to cooperate with Europe for peace, many efforts to convince a war-weary world of alternatives to war. Millions of words have been written, some in predatory fashion, some in loud warnings of war's horrors and hopelessness. To the regret of peace-loving people all have been unhappily futile. Professor Beard, commenting upon the seductive phrases by which war masquerades as "cooperation for peace," remarks:

To say that one favors "American cooperation in every effort to build alternatives to war" is, in my opinion, merely using words, unless one is prepared at the same time to demand the employment of American military and naval power in making effective any rules of peace agreed upon. To take part in talking without taking part in the coercion necessary to make talking prevail is, in my view, both futile and perilous. If our efforts to right historic wrongs and bring peace and reason to Europe in 1917-19 have not taught American citizens anything, no words of mine can add to their education.

No doubt all here know Professor Beard. That is his conclusion.

I might here digress for a moment to speak of the deep hatred with which our internationalists, now few in number, always refer to what they call the "isolationists"; to speak of the hideous epithets which they applied to us years and years ago, at the time when we were endeavoring to keep this Nation out of the League of Nations, and to recall something of that particular time, that it might be known how we were beset. But for the moment I will forego that, however happily I would refer to it, and I will proceed with the argument.

I may add that every man who pays a bit more taxation than European governments may escape their just debts, upon which they have willfully defaulted, understands.

Again we are asked to let ourselves be eased into such a position that there may happen to us again that which happened once before. I have no hesitancy in saying, although the Democratic leader yesterday derided the suggestion, that a step in the direction requested of us now is the first false step, and that the repeal of the embargo will place us in the shadow, walking down the bloody path of war.

What is this law, or part of the law, the repeal of which is asked—aye, demanded—by Great Britain and France, and

practically every internationalist in this country? It cannot be too often emphasized that the embargo provision of our law was for some years upon the books, and that it was notice to all the world of the policy we intended to pursue. It was an embargo applicable to all nations. It fulfilled every requirement of such a law. To repeal it now at the instance of one belligerent is simply to do as that belligerent desires, and to commit an unneutral act.

Whence comes the power of a foreign country to say to us we shall repeal a law which we solemnly passed, and which has been upon our statute books for 5 long years? What is the influence that is brought to bear upon us which says, "You shall not have a law of your own passing; you must repeal it; you must meet even in special session in order that it may be repealed forthwith; and you have no say in the matter? You must do as you are told, and if you do not do as you are told you are threatened with political extinction." That may be harsh from some standpoints, but not from others, and those now present who are familiar with what transpired in the past may have some inkling of what may happen in the future.

It is asserted by the proponents of repeal that this action should be taken because the act as it stands is favorable to Germany and disadvantageous to the Allies. It has for the time of its existence been a law equally applicable to all nations. Remember that. It was passed and it has been a law for nearly 5 years now, and it is equally applicable to all nations. It is impartial in that regard and it cannot be open to the assault upon it of being partial.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; and I mean no offense by refusing to yield, but I do not wish to yield during the progress of my address because it is not very long, and after I conclude I will engage in any sort of bout the Senator may prefer in relation to what I may say.

It is claimed by those whose sympathies would lead them to violate our neutrality—and I confess the urge is strong, and I can forgive those who permit their mentality to be overwhelmed by it—that the Germans have been preparing and have great stores of arms and munitions while the Allies have little. There is nothing to justify this claim but the bald statement of perfervid advocates. Certainly the records of this country shows no such disparity in the arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare that have been obtained by Germany. Indeed, the records of the Munitions Board show but little in this category purchased here. As to aircraft and appurtenances, over \$120,000,000 have been expended by Great Britain and France, while the expenditures of Germany have been negligible. The existing law prohibits the sale to all nations alike of arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare. It is the only fair plan that could be adopted. And do not forget that it has been the law of our land for more than 4 years past. Maintaining this provision does not favor Germany save in a negative way. In a positive way it affects all alike.

Germany gets nothing under the embargo. She will get nothing if the embargo shall be repealed, but for another reason. Germany, therefore, gets no benefit from the law except what might be hers by reason of an advantageous position. She gets no benefit from the embargo law at all, because the embargo law embargoes all equally.

It was back in 1936 that the President spoke of this law, and highly praised it. He then said:

As a consistent part of a clear policy, the United States is following a twofold neutrality toward any and all nations which engage in wars that are not of immediate concern to the Americas. First, we decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States.

Second, we seek to discourage the use by belligerent nations of any and all American products calculated to facilitate the prosecution of a war in quantities over and above our normal exports of them in time of peace.

Again in the same speech he said:

I trust that the objectives thus clearly and unequivocally stated will be carried forward by cooperation between this Congress and the President.

The United States can play but one role: Through a well-ordered neutrality to do naught to encourage the contest.

Whence comes the mighty movement to repeal the arms embargo? Surely it cannot be to safeguard American neutrality, for this was the rational policy declared by the President. It is not to take a step that would discourage the contest, for the repeal would have just the reverse effect. Why, then, the uproar? It can have but one purpose—to have us take sides in the war, by methods short of war at first, but inevitably by methods that will measure our full strength as a partisan. There are many Senators, doubtless, who approve repeal of the embargo on the ground that it would help the Allies, and that allied victory is in American interest. But this is a mere gamble. Such stakes are involved in the gamble that I decline to participate in it. If these Senators wish to give military or other help to the Allies to win the war, and if that is their motive, then the lifting of the embargo is an act of intervention. It is a mere gamble that we can change our law so as to help one side defeat the other and yet escape the consequences of war. The gamble may be successful but it is very speculative, and I will not gamble with American lives. It is a practical embargo against Germany, for this measure enables Great Britain and France, because of their mastery of the sea, to obtain everything they desire, save the few items in the embargo, and Germany, by reason of her position, can obtain none of them. This ought to satisfy the craving for discrimination which I observe is present in a few of my brethren, and it probably can be defended as legal. The lifting of the embargo cannot be so defended. The proposed change in the law to permit now an arms traffic that was prohibited when the war broke out is not a return to international law but a defiance of international law.

In a very able article by Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup, they say:

Thus these two factors—the governmental control already achieved by an act of Congress and a governmental desire to relax that control so as to help France and England—would combine to produce a result that the opposing belligerent Germany would pounce upon to establish the unneutral aspect of embargo-removing legislation. These factors would render inept and unconvincing the contention that when or if Congress removed an embargo which the United States was not obliged to impose, no legal duty to any belligerent is involved, provided every state engaged in war enjoys equal freedom to help itself to American resources.

The answer is that the manipulation of American governmental control already established through a statutory embargo, with the deliberate design of aiding a particular group of warring powers by an effort that takes cognizance of their relative supremacy at sea, is a deliberate taking of sides which marks intervention in the conflict. Such intervention is not impartial in spirit, and it is not abstention from participation in the war. It is, on the contrary, a specious form of interposition sought to be disguised by the opposing contenders. Yet the real character of such conduct shines out like a lighthouse in the fog. (From *Legal Doubt*, article by Charles Cheney Hyde and Philip C. Jessup.)

I repeat, the embargo law, when enacted, was just and impartial. It is just and impartial now. It was a people's law when enacted. It is still a people's law. The vice of the position of our adversaries is in their thought. Why all this thought of Great Britain and France? Why no word for America? In one breath the proponents minimize the law and say it is of little consequence, and in the next that it is a horrible obstruction to Great Britain and France. In all the thought of the good men who favor the law, has the stress ever been upon Great Britain and France? I repeat, this was the people's law when passed 4 or more years ago. It was acquiesced in practically by everybody. On more than one occasion it was praised by those in power and its virtues extolled. It is an American law enacted by Americans for the protection of America and Americans.

Have Senators forgotten so soon that we were to intervene in this war a few months ago to save democracy? Now it appears that the real reason was simply to aid Great Britain and France. A fair determination of this question shows that it cannot justly be done, save with the strong arm, and against this we protest.

With embargo repeal we are half in and half out of war. We know from our bitter experience in the past how easy it will be to shove us along until we are fully in, and this is the nub of the matter. We will be shoved along and pushed

about in relation to the present European war once we repeal the embargo, until we will not be sure where we stand or what we do. We will be pushed about and shoved along by those wily men who play the game of power politics, which some of our people, some of those who are snobbish, imagine they can play better than the diplomats of Europe, but when they indulge in the game of power politics with Europe they have as much chance as I would have trying to play poker with the Senator from Nevada. [Laughter.]

So it goes all along the line. European diplomats endeavor to have us get into that peculiar sort of a situation, and we will not do it. We ought not to do it, Mr. President; we ought not to do it.

Repeal the embargo? Why? It is said it does not amount to much. It is said that its retention is a matter of indifference. Yet such great store is set by it that some Senators would not let any measure become a law now unless it contained a repealer of the arms embargo. Some say it does not amount to anything, and yet England and France, across the sea, are perhaps using this war of theirs as a pawn in the matter.

It is the most peculiar war I ever knew of or ever read about. They are sitting about waiting to see what the Senate will do about this embargo problem, and the embargo problem has assumed such great importance that the measure must be passed at all hazards. I think anything in connection with the pending legislation, any phase of it or any other provision in it, would be yielded in order to secure the repeal of the embargo.

That is a way to fight, I confess, and I have no quarrel to find in that regard, but it is not the way in which you deal with your blood and your bone. It is not the way to deal with your children and your grandchildren.

I felt somewhat offended the other day when the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] described Senators who had children who would be subject to call in case of war. He did not mention me. I have grandchildren subject to call. He did not mention any of those of us who have grandchildren, and I felt that he had forgotten us in mentioning those who were subject to service in time of war. But we are dealing here with a question that is of great consequence to our children and our grandchildren and to all those whom we love, and to everything that we possess; and there is something wrong with the situation; there is something wrong with the measure; there is something wrong with the debate; there is something wrong here in relation to the manner in which the debate on this particular phase of the measure has been conducted. It is said, in spite of everything and at all times, "The legislation must be passed. The joint resolution must be enacted into law. It must be put upon the law books." And why? Nobody can tell and nobody does tell.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one observation?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Inasmuch as I referred to the Senator from Connecticut, I will yield to him. I would not otherwise.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask the Senator to yield to me only because he referred to me. I did not mention any members of his family. But I would like to take advantage of the opportunity to say now that I do not think there is a greater patriot in America than is the Senator from California, and my affection for him knows no bounds.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, do Senators remember there was a time in the League of Nations fight when certain reservations were presented by the little band of "isolationists"—isolationists! isolationists!—as they termed us all the time? That is all right; I will come to that in a few minutes. But there was a time when that little band presented certain reservations, and they were not adopted. There was a time when they were fighting with their backs to the wall to preserve the liberty of this country, and a great English statesman said to the one then in charge of the Government of the United States, "Let them have their reservations. Take them in, take them in," he said. "Let them have their reservations, and when they once get in we will take care of them." He knew full well that once we got in

half way we never could extricate ourselves. That was exactly his position. It was correct as a matter of tactics; and if Woodrow Wilson had followed it, despite the fact that we made the best fight of which we were capable, he would have had us in the League of Nations. But he would not accede to that suggestion, and his obduracy prevented our being in the League of Nations at that time.

The League of Nations partisans are very much in evidence in this controversy. There are only a few of them left. No longer is it a badge of honor to belong to that moribund society. No longer is it a badge of honor to march up and down the street and say, "Hurrah for Great Britain" and "Hurrah for the rest of Europe." The few who are left are all in full cry in support of the proposed legislation. Every one of them, from the west coast to the east coast, is taking his little part with Great Britain's representatives in trying to force through this particular measure. As they sing hosannas to "collective security," "choose the aggressor," and the holy league, interspersing their hymns with savage anathemas and bitter epithets against those who once took part against them, they permit their long-suppressed emotions again to influence their judgment. That is how this whole question arises. It is a matter of suppressed emotions which, righteous as they may seem, have risen to confound us in dealing with the subject.

If we are to take steps leading to war, there should be the best reasons for taking them. There should be no acting on false assumptions or wrong premises.

I have more respect for the man who feels that we ought to favor Britain and France, and who says that he would take us into war in behalf of Britain and France, than I have for the man who says he has no opinion, but would favor Britain and France. I do not blame those in this body who favor Britain and France for pursuing that course.

If we are to take sides leading to war, there should be the best reasons for taking them. There should be no acting on false assumptions or wrong premises. Yet the argument most frequently heard in support of the pending measure, reduced to its simplest terms, is that if we do not help to stop Hitler now, he will conquer Europe, and we shall be next—a perfectly idiotic assumption; and yet earnest and honest men repeat it. If we were not afflicted with a war psychology we would not listen for a quarter of a second to such a reason for repeal of the arms embargo. Hitler will never conquer Europe. It has never been done by anyone yet. Countless efforts have been made to establish hegemony by force, and none have succeeded. The closest approach to it was by Napoleon; and to compare Hitler with Napoleon is absurd.

Again, England has no equal in the play of power politics; and when this war is over she will be at the same old game, at which ambitious and snobbish Americans will still be trying their hand.

Again, the physical exhaustion after a war in Europe would leave the participants without the reserve manpower or material with which to launch further campaigns of aggression. Furthermore, Hitler could never successfully attack this country. He would leave behind him revolt everywhere; a resurgent nationalism would likely overcome him, and guerilla warfare would be rife. There would ever be behind him the "bear who walks like a man"; and if by that time we had not yet dissipated our resources we could stand on our own shores, with our airplanes and carriers, and a vastly superior navy, and laugh at his efforts. I hope we have heard the last of the argument "We shall be next"; and I hope nobody is frightened by the argument "We shall be next." There is no danger whatsoever of our being next. We used to say that 20 years ago when we were told that we had to fight to save democracy and had to fight for the sanctity of treaties. We were repeatedly told—do you not recall it?—that if we did not aid the Allies in stopping the Kaiser the Kaiser would take us next. In the time of Napoleon mothers frightened little children to make them be good by telling them that Napoleon would get them if they were not good, and at once they would stop their foolishness and be good. We were told then that if we did not stop the

Kaiser he would come over and get us. Now we are told that if we do not stop this war right away Hitler will come over and get us. It is absolutely rot and rubbish. There is not the least sense in it.

We cannot tell, from one day to another, how the war abroad will result. Who knows what the war across the Atlantic is about? Who knows what will be done? Who knows what the Russian Bear is contemplating? Who knows what is in the heads of the wily men over there who are determined to serve their own interests first? Who knows anything about what may transpire?

One day we see the Prime Minister of England courting Stalin. The next day we see him doing something else. Finally, not receiving from Stalin the degree of courtesy or the degree of favor that he thinks he should, he is done.

It reminds me of little boys who are running after something which is held by someone who has authority over them. They are all on the run now. They were on the run the other day for the purpose of obtaining the favor of Turkey. Great Britain beat the other fellow to it; and this morning the British said with great éclat, feeling very fine, that Chamberlain had won a great diplomatic victory. He was on the road to a great diplomatic victory only a short time ago when he met Stalin, and it was thought that Stalin would act in his behalf. Then he met with trouble, and Stalin took the greater part of the "swag."

I do not know what they are now doing, or what they will ultimately do, except that they are dividing the "swag," and they do not care a rap for the democracy of the United States of America. That is what I care for. They do not care whether or not they rip us asunder, tear us to pieces, and dismember us for their own purposes. They do not care; but I care, and every Senator ought to care. I can forgive young men, perhaps, who have not had experience; but it is a difficult thing to forgive old men who have such views.

So when it comes to the question of dealing with Stalin I do not know how they will deal with him, what they will do with him, or what he will do with them. I do not know what will happen. Nobody knows.

What are they fighting for over there? Does anyone know? No one knows; but we are to be in it, and we are to take part in it! We are to send our blood and bone over there to do the fighting. I know that every Senator says that he would not vote for a declaration of war, and would not send a single solitary soldier across the sea. That is the only good thing we have accomplished in this debate.

Wait until the bands start playing and the crowds start cheering. Wait until you hear the shouting and the tumult. Wait until then, and then tell me you will vote with me against any declaration of war. That is the time that I shall want your assurance, and not now. I do not say that to the detriment of my colleagues, and I am not saying it because I am trying to criticize them. There is a time when we do not know what we shall do a month hence, and that time is right now. You may say that you will not go to war. You may say—and you may mean it—that you will not vote for a declaration of war, or to send a single boy across the sea. Who ever believed that we were sending 2,000,000 men across the sea when we voted for a declaration of war before? No! No! No! You must steel your hearts against the first false step. You must say to yourselves that you will not take a single step toward war, or you will find you cannot resist when the time comes. That is exactly the difficulty we find in this situation.

Mr. President, I wanted to say a few words to two or three of our colleagues here who indulge in epithet or criticism of the poor old isolationists. They are able to tell you, Mr. President, Oh, it is a beautiful thing to be an internationalist, to go around and look upon the world, comprehend all that is in the world, and tell just what should be done under any given circumstances. The internationalist can see every country on the face of the earth but forget to love his own country and tell exactly what the other countries ought to do. So I say the internationalist has a tremendous advantage over us. We live here; we think only of our own country and we desire what is for its best interests. Everybody

believes that to be so; there should be no dissent from a sentiment such as that; everybody should believe and should be certain to say that everything they could do for the welfare and advantage of their own country should be done. But internationalists are constantly talking about the isolationists. I have here a little book that came to me the other day which sets forth a definition of isolationists that is even really better than that of the President. The President's was a very brief one. He said "an isolationist wishes to be isolated from the controversies and the wars of Europe." I may not quote him exactly, but that was substantially what he said in his Chatauqua speech. I wish to read a word or two from the book, *Deadly Parallel*, by C. Hartley Grattan. I acknowledge my debt to him. I have read his book with very great interest and with very great profit. I quote from it, as follows:

It is in this sense only that the continental American is an isolationist. He seeks to isolate this country from participation in attempts of foreign nations to "solve" foreign problems by force—from the wars beyond American borders which are being fought over confused issues to unpredictable conclusions. He does not in any sense believe that America can impose its conception of law and order on the world by force or create by force the conditions which feed and strengthen democracy in America. He does not believe that America knows all the answers required to solve the world's problems. He does not see in the present European situation any absolutely new and unique issues, though he is quite aware of the new dress in which the old issues today appear.

Americans, he thinks, should stay at home and mind their own very extensive business. It is his firm conviction that war today is a confession of bankruptcy, not evidence of a revitalized world. It cannot lead to a better world, but only to senseless destruction and social chaos. If Americans want a better world, they must build it in America. It is no contribution to the building to fight wars abroad. Americans will suffer far less from a policy of abstention with regard to Europe's muddle than by plunging into war with starry-eyed phony idealism, an idealism corrupted at the heart by its appeal to force.

Mr. President, I shall say but few words more. I feel very keenly the seriousness of the situation. I feel that should we take this first step we are done. I love this country. I have nothing else on God's earth but this country of mine. I do not want to see it go to war for one reason or another or to go into war because it is forced in. I do not want to see us risk war, because I think too much of the United States to risk war, and if we should repeal the embargo, we would risk war. Why should we risk war? That is what strikes me constantly—why should we risk war? I think the only thing to do is to let the law remain as it is.

We have had a law of this sort on the statute books for the last few years. The President of the United States has issued three different embargo proclamations since his term of office began.

The first was in connection with the war over the Chaco, the second in the Spanish War, the third in the Ethiopian War. He issued three proclamations of embargo, and the heavens did not fall when he issued them. They were thought to be effective. He issued them, and he boasted afterward that one, at least, did the job. I will not say that he boasted that the one issued in connection with the Italo-Ethiopian War did the job, because, perhaps, it did not. He struck a snag there as he went on, and he did not do all he desired; but in the case of the war over the Chaco he did do good, and, doing that good, he is entitled to the credit. The Spanish embargo was effective, although he was abused for it bitterly by a certain class of people in this country and elsewhere; but he stood by his guns; he maintained the embargo. So three different times since he has been President has he maintained the embargo.

It is said now that he must not maintain the embargo in issue here because France and Britain say "No." I say, "Yes," and the United States Senate ought to say "Yes"; this country ought to say, "Yes; we will have an embargo; we will have an embargo of our choosing; we will have an embargo that we adopted solemnly after due consideration and due deliberation. We passed the embargo, and we, in spite of France and Britain, will maintain that embargo." It takes brave men to say that, of course; it took brave men to do what has been done in order to protect that embargo; but

we have the courage, we have the nerve, we have the ability, and we here can say it. Why should we not say it? What is there for us left in life, what is there still that any of us may care for? It does not make any difference to me whether I am reelected or defeated when the time comes; it does not make any difference to me whether I am going to be one man or another in that particular campaign; I will stand here until doomsday, if I am the only man who so stands, and plead for what I believe to be right and what my conscience justifies. Stand up, Americans! Stand up, Americans! Stand up, Americans, for your rights; stand as you ought to stand in this struggle for maintaining that which will prevent the United States going into another war.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it would be presumptuous on my part even to imagine that I could change the views of any Member of this Senate on the pending joint resolution. I am confident that all Senators have long since made up their minds on the issues involved and are now prepared to vote. No measure could have been more thoroughly discussed, and all phases of the problems more ably presented, than has been the case with respect to the pending legislation. We have heard the ardent pleas of most of the "big guns" of the Senate, and far be it that a member of its "popgun corps" could now make more convincing arguments than have been heretofore presented. I shall find consolation for my efforts in the hope that, in a feeble way, I may allay the fears of my fellow Americans and point out to them that a favorable vote on the joint resolution will not involve our Nation in war.

It should be a comforting assurance to the American people that war can come only if the Congress declares it. War can be carried on only if the Congress raises and supports armies for that specific purpose. So far, no Senator has raised his voice in favor of war; on the contrary, all have proclaimed for peace. We differ only in opinion as to the best course to pursue in these trying times. Speaking for myself, and for other fathers of fine chaps, I shall not vote, under any circumstances, to send my son or the sons of my fellow Americans to fight the battles of those who inhabit the Old World. I firmly believe that in this I express the views of every Member of the Senate; and, should I not, let those who take issue speak up. [Pause.] On the other hand, few, if any of us would hesitate to vote our entire resources, if need be, in order to protect our country from the enemy, should invasion be attempted.

Mr. President, for years after the disastrous World War, few people felt that the Eastern Hemisphere would ever again engage in a major conflict. It was believed then that the nations of the world, especially those which actually engaged in the horrible death-dealing battles, were fully convinced of the futility of war. From every land and from persons in every walk of life came proposals to avert future wars. Our people were especially interested in a plan that would assure a lasting peace. Some felt that the munition manufacturers of this Nation had been responsible for our entry into the conflict, and the finger of guilt was pointed in their direction. Investigations were made by the Senate, hearings were had, and the public became aroused as a result of the disclosures made. I am informed that the hearings were in the nature of an ex parte proceeding and few if any persons who took an opposite view evidenced sufficient interest to refute the charges made. I do not mean that an opportunity was not given them to disprove those charges but many felt that the accusations were so far-fetched that refutation of the evidence produced was unnecessary. Be that as it may, the evidence adduced at these hearings made a profound impression on the American people and a stirring sentiment then prevailed that the most effective method to stop wars was to take away the profit and the best way to accomplish that was to prevent the exportation of arms and ammunition to belligerent nations.

It was in such an atmosphere that the so-called Embargo Act was conceived and later enacted. The people were for it and I am informed that few Senators opposed its enactment into law. At the time evidently little or no thought was given to the existing facilities and geographical situations of

the various countries of the world; and although the embargo was intended to apply to all alike it created decided advantages in favor of some nations in contrast to others. It is clear to me that the law created a most unfair disadvantage to those nations that had established sea power and advantage in favor of those nations that had lesser sea power or no naval equipment at all. I will not discuss this phase of the problem further for the reason that it has been ably argued during this debate by many Senators.

Mr. President, it has been frequently stated here in the course of this debate, and by scores of speakers throughout the Nation, that it would be unneutral for us to amend the act while a war is in progress. Many have said that such an act would offend Germany, and that Herr Hitler would be displeased. Mr. President, I ask: What do we owe to this mad dictator, this insatiable despoiler of men and nations, this violator of treaties, that we must tread on tiptoe to spare him displeasure? Since when has it become necessary that we should consult with Hitler or with any other foreign power before considering the wishes of our own people? No nation is being taken by surprise if we repeal the arms embargo. The world was put on notice by the President of the United States on January 4 of this year, when he called attention to the possibility that our neutrality laws may prove to operate unevenly and unfairly, and give aid to aggressor nations and deny it to the victims. From April 5 to May 8 hearings were held before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on various neutrality bills, some of which had as their object the repeal of the arms-embargo provisions of the present law. On May 29 House Joint Resolution 306 was introduced by Mr. Bloom, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and from June 2 through the 13th, hearings were held on the bill before Mr. Bloom's committee, and on June 17 the bill was reported favorably. From June 27 to 30 House Joint Resolution 306 was debated in the House of Representatives and finally passed, and on July 5 it was received by the Senate and referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. On July 11 the committee, by a vote of 12 to 11, decided to postpone consideration of neutrality legislation until the next session of Congress. Again, on July 14, the Senate received a message from President Roosevelt, transmitting a statement from Secretary Hull, strongly recommending that neutrality legislation be considered before adjournment. Although we were warned then that war might come, few of us believed it, and Congress adjourned without enacting neutrality legislation. Mind you, when speaking of neutrality legislation I refer to that which had to do with the repeal of the arms-embargo provision of the existing law. In the light of the foregoing facts, how can we now be accused of being unneutral by repealing it because it so happens that at present a war is raging?

Mr. President, let us examine the so-called neutrality law and contrast its provisions with some of the provisions of the pending legislation. In this comparison, my purpose is to show that the pending measure is less likely to lead us into war than the existing law. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, the paramount issue before us is how best to keep our country out of this conflict. What then would cause us to engage in war? Is it the mere sale of arms and ammunition and other implements of war? I do not concede this to be a fact. No nation should have cause to complain if we afford it the same treatment that is accorded other nations in this respect.

One of the cardinal principles of neutrality is to show no preference or partiality to any of the nations engaged in war. It is our duty to treat them all alike and on the same plane and basis. In being neutral we should be ready and willing to sell to all of those engaged in conflict on the same basis; and, in effect, cause them to receive the same rights and privileges.

The pending joint resolution provides that very thing. It states that all nations engaged in war may purchase from us any articles or materials. It requires that all sales must be made for cash, and that title must pass to the purchaser before the ships sail from our ports. In addition, it further provides that no American ships may be used to trans-

port such articles or materials to belligerents, or to nations bordering on waters declared by the President to be danger zones.

Why, Mr. President, the bill not only prevents the use of American ships to carry articles and materials to a belligerent, but it serves notice on the citizens of this country that no loss incurred by them in connection with the sale or transfer of any such articles or materials shall be made the basis of any claims put forward by the Government of the United States. Under the joint resolution, since no American ships may be used for transporting articles and materials to nations engaged in war or to nations bordering on waters declared by the President to be danger zones, it necessarily follows that the life of no American seaman will become imperiled. Since title to all goods and articles sold must pass when loaded aboard ship at an American port, it likewise necessarily follows that no property of an American citizen will become exposed to seizure or destruction.

Mr. President, I repeat, what then could cause us to engage in war? Would it not be the wanton taking of the lives of our citizens engaged in a lawful undertaking on the high seas? Would it not be the unlawful destruction or confiscation of the property of these citizens plying their trade with belligerent nations? Our experience in the World War answers that question.

Mr. President, the pending legislation makes a criminal of a person who violates any of its provisions. It places the officers and directors of a corporation in the category of criminals should any of the provisions of the pending joint resolution be violated. A fine of not more than \$50,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, may be imposed on anyone who violates the provisions of the act. The joint resolution goes still further. It provides that citizens of this country traveling as passengers on belligerent ships who thus expose their lives to danger, contrary to the provisions of the joint resolution, are likewise criminals. Each offender is subject to a fine of \$10,000, or imprisonment for 2 years, or both, for each violation. What else can we do, within reason, to protect the lives and property of our citizens, except to make it unlawful for them to engage in acts which would cause us to become involved in war?

Let us contrast those restrictions with the provisions of the law as now written. It is therein provided that whoever shall export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States, or any of its possessions, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. The law makes it a criminal act for a person to ship such articles. As to the sale and transportation of all other goods and materials the law is silent. American ships, manned by American sailors, can transport any and all other goods and materials available to countries engaged in war, or in fact to any place in the world. Such ships, so laden, may travel in waters infested with submarines, planted with mines, strafed by giant combatant bombers, and if anything should happen to them, our laws grant them recourse through our Government. Should the war continue and should American ships and American sailors be exposed to belligerent fire, I predict that, sooner or later, we will be called upon to protect the lives and property of those of our citizens engaged in such traffic.

Mr. President, I ask the question: Why should we single out arms, ammunition, or implements of war and permit the sale of all materials, machinery, and other articles necessary to manufacture such goods? I ask the indulgence of the Senate in order that I may cite some of the articles that are embargoed under the present law, in contrast to other articles that are not embargoed, but which are just as essential to a warring nation.

To begin with, the present law embargoes shipments to warring nations of rifles, carbines, machine guns; automatic rifles, automatic pistols and revolvers; guns, howitzers, and mortars; ammunition for those weapons; hand grenades, bombs, torpedoes, mines, and depth charges; aerial gun mounts and frames, bomb racks, torpedo carriers, bomb and torpedo release mechanisms—all these ingenious instruments

of death and destruction may not be sold under the present law, and no nation at war may draw upon the United States for any of these articles. But there is no prohibition against these same nations obtaining from us all the ferro-alloys, steel billets, sheets and tubes, brass ingots and disks, and copper ingots that they may desire, in order to convert those materials into those same death-dealing weapons and ammunition.

Likewise, the present law embargoes armored tanks, military armored vehicles, and armored trains—but there is nothing in the law which prevents shipment from this country to warring nations of any amount of standard four-wheel-drive chassis, and standard railroad cars—and any military expert will state that those innocent so-called peacetime vehicles are readily convertible into monsters of war.

The law states that no person or company can ship to warring nations any aircraft "both heavier and lighter than air, designed, adapted, and intended for aerial combat, either assembled, unassembled, or dismantled." But we can go right on shipping to those countries unlimited quantities of steel billets, aluminum sheets and shapes, fabrics and frame materials, such as spruce for nonmetal planes, and other articles of this nature which go to make up warring airplanes.

We throw up our hands in horror at the very mention of poisonous gases, and it is provided in the present law that we shall not export to warring nations any mustard gas, methylchlorarsine, diphenylchlorarsine, and a long list of other 10- and 12-syllable tongue-twisters. But is there any prohibition against the shipment to those nations of chlorine, bromine, sulfur and pyrites, arsenic, and other basic chemicals from which deadly poisonous gases are manufactured? The answer is, "No."

Powders and explosives are embargoed under the act—but I am unable to find anything in the law which prohibits a belligerent nation from purchasing, in this country, any quantity of cotton and wood pulp, with which to make cellulose, sulphuric and nitric acid, toluene, aniline, phenol, ammonia, potassium nitrate, powdered aluminum, and charcoal. There is a long list of others, all of which are necessary to the manufacture of such products, but I will not burden the Senate with them.

Most astonishing of all, Mr. President, is the fact that not only can we sell all of these materials of war to belligerent nations, but we can send them to those nations in our own ships, manned by American sailors.

Mr. President, aware of such inconsistencies, I cannot see the necessity, or the reason, or the wisdom, of throttling our munitions manufacturers as is done under the law now in force. One of the motivating reasons for enacting the arms embargo in the first place was to discourage war among foreign nations. We all have seen how utterly it has failed in its purpose, and so it now becomes incumbent upon us to remove the embargo, and place all industries, all articles and goods of export, on the same basis. As I pointed out a few moments ago, there is no attempt in the present law to deprive any other branch of industry or agriculture of its legitimate share of foreign trade. We all admit that we must maintain our export markets if this country is to avoid a depression even worse than that which began in 1929. Therefore, in common fairness, why should we penalize any one industry and prohibit exportation to foreign markets of the articles manufactured by that industry? The hearings held before the Special Munitions Industry Investigating Committee of the Senate during the years 1934, 1935, and 1936 were replete with charges against the munitions manufacturers of profiteering, unethical practices, bribery, graft, greed—in fact, when one reads the record it would seem they committed all the cardinal sins. But did anyone ever attempt to ascertain how much profiteering, how much graft, how much bribery, occurred in other industries during the World War period? It has been shown that our foreign exports to the allied nations during the 3 years ending June 30, 1917, totaled \$9,786,000,000. Of this figure only a fraction over 12 percent, or \$1,207,000,000, represented arms, ammunition, and implements of war. That leaves \$8,579,000,000 of

other goods and materials and foodstuffs that were exported to the Allies during the 3-year period. Everyone knows that the munitions manufacturers were not the only persons who became enriched during the World War. It is my belief that an investigation into profiteering among other industries during the World War period would have revealed similar wrongdoing and profiteering on the same grand scale revealed in the munitions industry.

Mr. President, I want it well understood that I hold no brief for the munitions manufacturers. From a humane standpoint, their existence and purpose are abhorrent. I have no interest in them, except that I consider them one of our most important adjuncts to national defense. And, as I have just stated, I cannot see the wisdom of throttling them at this time, when our full attention should be centered on every possible manner and means of improving our national defenses for our own protection.

Continuation of the arms embargo cannot longer be considered as a deterrent to war among foreign nations, except that it might make it easier for aggressor nations, for those nations which have prepared over the past few years for waging war, to lay waste the weaker and more peaceably inclined nations. Every man in the Senate knows full well that our munitions plants will become our primary defenses in event of aggression.

Yes, Mr. President; a day may come when we will be face to face with aggression. I pray to God that it may not be so, and I am not forecasting it. Yet we must not be so blind as to close our eyes to such a possibility. And before that day comes let us all realize and understand that these very munitions manufacturers who are scorned and castigated and labeled as "war instigators" by some so-called isolationists—these very munitions manufacturers can and will furnish the means to save us and our children and our cherished possessions from destruction, provided we do not now strangle them into impotency. I maintain that they should be permitted to receive their legitimate share of all foreign commerce at all times, but under the cash-and-carry proviso and other restrictions that are incorporated in the pending resolution, and always looking to the preservation of our Nation above everything else.

Mr. President, while on this particular subject there is one other point I desire to present. As I have just stated, I am not prophesying that this Nation will ever be invaded. I hope and pray that none of us here today, or our children, or our children's children, down to the end of time, will ever be faced with the horror of having to shed human blood to defend these shores against outside aggression. But, Mr. President, science has advanced rapidly during the last decade. Modern warfare has taken tremendous strides. No one knows what further advances will be made tomorrow. There may come a time when we will look to friendly nations across the seas for the privilege of buying modern, up-to-date weapons to defend ourselves against the enemy. Perhaps there will be some new, ingenious invention of warfare available in only one nation or locality which will be essential to our defense. Shall we now set a precedent by continuing this arms embargo, slamming the door, as it were, in the face of friendly powers across the sea without some day ruing those actions? Is it not within the realm of possibility that some day we shall be calling upon friendly foreign powers for the same privileges they today expect of us? Let us not be so shortsighted and blind that we will by our actions today set a precedent which some time in the future might prove a boomerang to us and endanger the very existence of our Nation and people.

Mr. President, I again ask the question, Which is more likely to lead us to war, the mere sale of arms, ammunition, or implements of war under the restrictions provided for in the pending legislation, including cash and carry, or the sale and delivery of articles or materials to make those instruments of death, without restrictions, as is provided for in the law that is now on our statute books? Surely the answer to that question is self-evident.

But it is argued by the opponents of the joint resolution under discussion, "We favor the cash-and-carry plan if only you reenact the embargo provisions." As I have previously

pointed out, I can see no reason for discriminating between our producers of raw materials and our manufacturers of finished products. Without food and clothing, soldiers could not carry on the war. Without gasoline and oil, all of the cherished mechanized units and airplanes and warships would be useless. Why not embargo all articles or materials to belligerents, and thus be classified as honest-to-goodness isolationists? Why not have real isolation or none at all?

In this connection, I have not heard a single Senator advocate complete embargo against the shipment of any and all materials to belligerent nations; and there is good reason for their silence on this phase of the question.

Permit me to present to the Senate a few figures I have compiled from data furnished by the United States Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce showing our 1938 foreign trade with the nations which are now at war. I have listed the exports and imports between this country and each unit of the British Empire, between this country and the French Republic and each of her possessions, and between this country and Germany and her conquered provinces. I shall not take the Senate's time to read these statements in detail, but I ask unanimous consent that the tables be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWARTZ in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tables are as follows:

UNITED STATES FOREIGN TRADE STATISTICS, YEAR 1938
(Compiled from data furnished by Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, United States Department of Commerce)

Summary

	Exports	Imports
Grand total:		
All foreign trade 1938.....	\$3,094,094,621	\$1,960,528,295
British Empire and French Republic.....	\$1,446,887,493	\$711,001,537
Percent.....	46.7	36.3
Germany.....	\$107,588,308	\$64,537,217
Percent.....	3.4	3.3

United States trade with British Empire, year 1938

	Exports	Imports
United Kingdom.....	\$521,123,664	\$118,246,956
Dominions, colonies, protectorates, and mandates:		
Americas:		
Canada.....	467,061,884	260,273,830
Newfoundland and Labrador.....	7,676,715	6,581,910
British Honduras.....	1,056,593	2,343,645
Bermuda.....	3,952,283	316,314
Barbados.....	955,712	872,339
Jamaica.....	5,749,963	1,197,004
Trinidad and Tobago.....	7,442,414	1,635,859
Other British West Indies.....	3,486,261	1,233,073
British Guiana.....	1,025,462	816,407
Falkland Islands.....	8,171	14,453
Total.....	499,015,458	274,784,833
Europe:		
Ireland.....	26,947,071	957,620
Gibraltar.....	433,389	2,154
Malta, Gozo, and Cyprus Islands.....	760,935	329,836
Total.....	28,141,395	1,289,610
Asia:		
Aden.....	304,472	233,558
Palestine.....	3,166,153	555,394
British India.....	33,441,399	58,348,937
Burma.....	2,322,515	223,998
British Malaya.....	8,854,252	112,270,544
Ceylon.....	1,344,304	16,346,132
Hong Kong.....	21,288,216	3,366,803
Total.....	70,721,311	191,345,366
Africa:		
Union of South Africa.....	70,064,955	15,982,835
British East Africa.....	3,759,365	5,527,086
Other British South Africa.....	1,697,210	2,977,175
Gold Coast.....	2,785,546	6,725,304
Nigeria.....	2,176,485	4,077,175
Other British West Africa.....	406,373	608,434
Total.....	80,889,934	518,909,075
Oceania:		
Australia.....	68,823,036	8,713,681
New Zealand.....	23,365,864	6,559,339
British Oceania.....	628,107	318,237
Total.....	92,817,007	15,591,257

RECAPITULATION

United Kingdom.....	\$521,123,664	\$118,246,956
American possessions.....	499,015,458	274,784,833
European possessions.....	28,141,395	1,289,610
Asiatic possessions.....	70,721,311	191,345,366
African possessions.....	80,889,934	518,909,075
Oceania.....	92,817,007	15,591,257
Total.....	771,585,105	518,909,075
Total, British Empire.....	1,292,708,769	637,156,031

United States trade with France and possessions, year 1938

	Exports	Imports
France.....	\$133,834,657	\$54,060,696
Colonies, protectorates, and mandates:		
Americas:		
Miquelon and St. Pierre Islands.....	130,814	17,043
French West Indies.....	2,009,124	192,613
French Guiana.....	118,693	36,353
Total.....	2,258,641	246,009
Asia:		
Syria.....	2,688,435	2,268,096
French Indochina.....	3,128,403	7,137,257
Total.....	5,816,838	9,405,353
Oceania: French Oceania.....	681,540	611,835
Africa:		
Algeria.....	2,698,888	2,433,639
Tunisia.....	1,435,339	2,004,649
Morocco.....	3,221,953	1,361,247
Madagascar.....	507,519	1,820,785
Other French Africa.....	3,823,449	2,501,293
Total.....	11,687,148	10,121,613

RECAPITULATION

	Exports	Imports
France.....	\$133,834,657	\$54,060,696
American possessions.....	2,258,641	246,009
Asiatic possessions.....	5,816,838	9,405,353
Oceanic possessions.....	681,540	611,835
African possessions.....	11,687,148	10,121,613
Total.....	20,344,067	20,384,810
Total, France and possessions.....	154,178,724	74,445,506

United States trade with Germany and conquered possessions, year 1938

	Exports	Imports
Germany.....	\$107,588,308	\$64,537,217
Austria.....	745,962	1,275,772
Czechoslovakia.....	26,492,796	26,174,335
Poland and Danzig.....	24,695,903	13,416,775
Total.....	51,934,661	40,866,882

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to call particular attention to the recapitulation of our 1938 export and import trade which is presented along with these tabulations.

It will be seen that our total foreign exports in 1938 amounted to \$3,094,094,621. Of this huge sum, \$1,292,708,769 represents transactions with the United Kingdom and her possessions and \$154,178,724 with France and her possessions, or a total of \$1,446,887,493 in export trade with the so-called democratic allies, or 46.7 percent of our total foreign exports in 1938. A total of \$107,588,308 was exported into Germany during 1938, or 3.4 percent of our total foreign exports for that year. Thus it is seen that a real, honest-to-goodness policy of isolation would call upon American agriculture and American industry to sacrifice over 50 percent of our foreign export markets.

Mr. President, as has been pointed out by several Senators in the course of this debate, the present law does not prevent the sale of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to neutral nations. They may pile up and store all the weapons and ammunition they desire, no matter how near or far they are from warring nations. The neutral nations may sell

what they manufacture to those engaged in war and retain what they purchase from us for their own use. The chances are 10 to 1 that some neutral nations will buy and resell to a warring nation, notwithstanding the provision in the present law against such transactions. Although Russia is busily engaged in crushing and intimidating smaller nations and robbing them of their independence and their very lifeblood, she is not supposed to be at war. She is, according to reports, leaning toward Germany. Under the present law she may purchase from us all of the arms, ammunition, or implements of war she desires. If she chooses, she may sell them to Germany. What will prevent her?

We certainly are not called upon to police Russia to see that all of such articles as she buys are used by her own armies. On the other hand, if we should refuse to sell arms or ammunition or implements of war to Russia at any time she is not actually engaged in war, would not that result in strained relations between the two countries? Would not Russia have a perfect right to resent such action on our part?

The same considerations apply to all of the Balkan nations; in fact, to all nations that are not actually engaged in war and that are supposedly neutral. Is it not plain that because of our inability to follow through the use to which arms, ammunition, or implements of war are put by neutrals, questions may arise that may involve us? Why take the risk? Why not sell all articles or materials to all nations, whether engaged in war or not, and put all of them in the same category and on the same footing? Such a procedure, in my humble opinion, will be more conducive to peace than the method provided under the existing law.

Mr. President, the joint resolution restricts credits so as further to minimize the possibility of our engaging in war. The joint resolution makes it unlawful for any person within the United States to make any loans or extend any credits to any government, political subdivision, or person. Again, the legislation brands as a criminal any person who violates this section and provides a penalty of \$50,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. All of these precautions are taken in order to make it certain that this Government will not be called upon to defend and protect the rights of any citizen in such transactions as he may undertake with belligerent nations. What a pity that such a requirement was not on the statute books of our country when the World War was fought. Had that been done, our Government would not now be in the red for about \$13,000,000,000. Another thing: It is fortunate that the money due by our Allies was not borrowed from our citizens direct. I fear that if the huge sums now due by our Allies were reduced to bond issues and owned by our people, there would be little sympathy shown in the direction of those debtors. Did Senators ever try to figure out how a person feels toward one who is indebted to him and who does not pay? Two persons can be the best of friends. Let one borrow from the other and not repay and see what happens. Friendship ceases, and they become enemies.

In order to prevent the engendering of such a feeling in any of our people who might desire to invest in foreign securities, this joint resolution makes a criminal of one who violates its provisions and subjects him to a fine and imprisonment. Like violators of other provisions of this resolution, he is placed in the same category as a common thief or an itinerant burglar.

No, Mr. President; I insist that the pending legislation provides every reasonable safeguard to protect our American citizens, their property, and their credits. The restrictions imposed are such that I can conceive of no way that we could possibly become embroiled in war should the pending legislation become law. Our people are being deprived of rights on the seas that have been theirs for over 125 years, all to the end that we shall not become involved in war, because exercising this right to the high seas may bring dire results and plunge the whole Nation into war.

Mr. President, I have heard many eloquent appeals made by Senators and others favoring a retention of the arms embargo. Their pleas were forceful and eloquent. Because

of their "abhorrence of war," some permitted their sentiments, their feelings, their passion to becloud their better judgment. Fired by their deep conviction for peace, some suggested that instead of deliberating on the question of selling arms and ammunition, we should devote our time and our efforts in the direction of a lasting peace. Surely no one would hesitate to give aid in that direction if only an honorable peace could be obtained. Are we to attempt to negotiate such a peace without invitation or suggestions? President Roosevelt offered many peace suggestions during the current year before the war was declared, but his pleas fell on deaf ears. Herr Hitler ridiculed the suggestions made and pointed the finger of scorn in our direction and intimated that we should attend to our own business. Now that this power-crazed madman has seized Austria, taken Czechoslovakia, and overrun Poland, he desires peace on his own terms. In effect, he says: "I have completed my conquest for the time being; I am willing to lay down my arms if you do the same." No, Mr. President; I can see no early peace for Europe; in fact, I can visualize no peace for our neighbors across the seas as long as this insatiable brute is permitted to rule over Germany. Better that we attend to our own business and hope that England and France and their Allies will conquer this foe of human liberties and restore peace among themselves and their neighbors.

No, Mr. President, the American people do not trust Hitler. As was shown by a poll taken by Dr. Gallup on October 17, 86 percent of Americans disagree with Hitler's attitude that war should be stopped since the Polish question is settled. Our people list "Hitlerism" as the main issue, and add comments of which the following are typical: "Hitler cannot be trusted." "Hitler will always be a threat to the world peace." "Germany would like to make peace in order to make war later on."

Mr. President, the people of this country have an irrepressible desire to remain at peace. They do not wish to be parties to the conflict now raging in Europe. Although our people have expressed in no uncertain terms their dislike for Hitler and what he stands for, I am convinced that they are not so imbued with the allied cause that they would consent to sending our soldiers across the ocean to fight for them. Few if any persons within the sound of my voice would cherish a victory favoring Germany. I am quite certain that a vast majority of the American people favor the Allies, not because they love England and France the better, but because of the form of government they stand for. The American people as a whole have a high regard for the German people as such, but they despise their leadership.

The American people do not want dictator neighbors to the north of them—in fact, anywhere near their borders. They prefer as their neighbors people who believe in and cherish freedom. That, Mr. President, is no doubt what prompted the American Nation to vote so overwhelmingly in favor of the Allies winning the war, in a recent poll made by Fortune magazine. In answer to the question "Who do you want to win the war?" the results indicated:

	Percent
Allies	83
Germany	1
Neither side or don't know	16

No, Mr. President, we want no war; we want peace; we prefer to live in a world where it will be safe to apply the Golden Rule to all of our neighbors.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let us never forget our own avowed determination to keep America out of war. We must not permit our respective constituencies to be swayed by insidious propaganda that may lead them from the path of peace; and finally, let us bear in mind that America can be drawn into this conflict only if our citizens refuse to accept the bulwarks of protection which we are now attempting to build around them, and if we, the Members of this Senate, should be compelled to declare war as a consequence. [Applause.]

Mr. President, before I relinquish the floor to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], I desire to ask unanimous consent to insert in the

RECORD at this point a brief statement entitled "Principle Uses of Strategic Materials." I call the particular attention of the Senate to the fact that each and every one of these raw materials is considered by military experts as essential to any nation that is at war; and yet there is nothing in the present so-called neutrality law which prevents our selling these materials to belligerent nations in unlimited quantities, and even delivering them to the ports of the belligerents in our own ships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCIPAL USES OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS

Material	Use
Aluminum metal-----	Aircraft. Motors. Paints. Radio and telephone. Ammunition and other military equipment. Construction.
Antimony-----	Ammunition. Type metal. Bearing metal. Battery plates. Paints and chemicals. Primers.
Chromium----- (Chromite ore containing approximately 50 percent Cr ₂ O ₃)	Alloy steels. Plating metal. Paint pigments. Refractories. Tanning. Resistance wire.
Coconut shells-----	Gas-mask charcoal.
Manganese ferrograde ore----- (50 percent manganese)	Steel making.
Chemical MnO ₂ -----	Chemicals. Dry batteries.
Manila fiber-----	Cordage. Rope.
Mica----- (Sheets and splittings)	Insulators for spark plugs. Condensers and commutators. Radio tubes.
Nickel metal-----	Alloy steels. Monel metal. Coinage. Resistance wire. Plating metal.
Optical glass-----	Fire-control instruments. Cameras. Field glasses. Theodolites. Transits. Microscopes, etc.
Quartz crystals-----	Radio-frequency controls. Pivots. Laboratory vessels. Ornaments.
Quicksilver----- (Mercury)	Explosives. Paints. Drugs. Electric apparatus. Mercury boilers.
Quinine----- (Expressed as quinine sulfate)	Medicine.
Rubber-----	Tires. Fabrics. Insulating materials. Rubber goods.
Silk (raw)-----	Parachutes. Powder bags. Clothing. Cable covering.
Tin metal-----	Plating containers. Bearing metal. Solder. Bronze. Tin plate. Tinfoil.
Tungsten ore----- (Containing 60 percent WO ₃ or 40 percent metal)	Tool steel. Alloy steels. Tungsten carbide. Electric contacts. Lamp filaments. A. P. bullet cores. Radio tubes.
Wool, excluding carpet wool----- (Greasy basis)	Textiles. Felt. Carpet.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to me by Rt. Rev. J. J. Rousseau, pastor of the Church of the

Assumption, dated, Franklin, La., October 18, 1939, together with copy of a letter addressed by him to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters referred to are as follows:

CHURCH OF THE ASSUMPTION,
Franklin, La., October 18, 1939.

The Honorable ALLEN ELLENDER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts, wrote to me asking for my opinion on the embargo law now being discussed in Congress.

I, of Louisiana, whom you represent, with thousands of others, take the liberty to send you a copy of the letter which I sent to Senator WALSH.

I had the opportunity to meet 15 priests yesterday, who are unanimously of my opinion, and they told me that if I would discuss the question with the rest of the Catholic clergy in Louisiana that I would find them all, with perhaps a few exceptions, of our opinion.

Very respectfully yours,

J. J. ROUSSEAU.

FRANKLIN, LA., October 16, 1939.

Mr. DAVID I. WALSH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I received your letter and a copy of your speech entitled "The Forerunner of War." You ask me for a reply.

First, I highly respect your opinion. I sincerely believe that you are sincere, namely, that the lifting of the embargo on munitions of war would eventually lead us to war.

Before giving you my opinion on the subject I will say that I have just returned to my native country, the United States, from an extensive tour of France and Italy. It was my third trip abroad.

I am 60 years old. I saw and see more clearly today the evil effects of our going to war in 1917.

I, like you, am unalterably opposed to the idea that we should enter into the present European conflict, which had begun while I was still in Europe.

My opinion is that we should repeal the embargo law and adopt and pass laws which will protect this Nation from being embroiled in the present European conflict. These laws are well known to you, namely, the cash-and-carry system, etc.

If we do not repeal the embargo law, we stamp a moral stigma on our Nation of being moral cowards. If the various present dictators and the future ones know that our markets, which are almost inexhaustible, are open to the nations which are unjustly attacked, as in this case, they will think twice and more before attacking weaker nations and disturb the peace of the world.

Second. By repealing the embargo law, I am of the opinion that the European war will end very much sooner than it would be by keeping the embargo law.

Third. I am of the opinion that there is a greater danger of our being "pushed" in the European conflict by keeping the embargo law than by repealing it, because, as I said above, it would serve to lengthen the duration of the war, and it would give more opportunities to some to make use of foul means, principally on the ocean, which would serve to fan and inflame American minds and force us to go to war.

Fourth. It is my sincere opinion that by lifting the embargo on arms Hitler and his clique will realize that they will soon be completely beaten, then lose courage, and do like the old Kaiser, jump their back fences, and run for protection in some foreign land. The German people as a whole don't want war no more than we do. I suppose that you are familiar with the various methods used by Hitler and his clique to keep the German people in a state of moral and physical slavery.

From conversation with Italians and non-Italians residing in Italy, I am convinced that the Italians are not in sympathy with Hitler and his clique; and even if Mussolini should attempt to enter the European conflict on the side of Hitler, which I doubt that he ever will, the Italians at home and even the Army would revolt. The Italian Prince had himself appointed by his old father at the head of a large part of the Army. You probably know that he is not on friendly terms with Mussolini, and is unalterably opposed to Hitler's regime. By repealing the embargo law you might see Italy wage active warfare against Hitler and his regime, especially now that Hitler has become a friend of the arch enemy of Christianity, especially the true Christianity instituted by the God-man over 1,900 years ago.

Fifth. I take it for granted that you are a first-class Christian man and that you are a firm believer in the church instituted by the God-man and that you consider the saving of your soul and the souls of mankind the most important duty of true Christians on this planet, and that no sacrifices are too big to deter true Christians from doing all that they can to promote the cause of Christianity. But you are also certainly aware of the fact that Hitler and his clique have persecuted the Church of Christ in Germany and Austria. To make matters worse, Hitler has even invited Stalin, the arch enemy of Christ's holy church, to help him during the present war.

Is it not our duty as true Christian men and true followers of the One who allowed Himself to be crucified on the tree of the cross for the salvation of mankind to do all we can to lend a helping

hand to defeat those two enemies of the church He instituted on earth to help mankind to save their immortal souls? When that same true Christianity was threatened by cruel invaders in 1571, Pope Pius V did not hesitate to form a powerful league among the Christian princes of southern Europe, but begged them to wage actual war against those vast armies which were threatening Christianity in Europe. Then followed a most decisive battle at Lepanto, where the Christians were victorious and the enemies of Christianity were decisively beaten and Christianity and Christian civilization were saved in Europe.

These and other facts too numerous to include lead me to form my opinion that the law on the embargo of arms should be repealed.

Very respectfully yours,

J. J. ROUSSEAU.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, to me one of the great things about this debate on our neutrality policy is the absence of unreasoning partisanship in the attitudes of Senators of all persuasions. The Senate has risen to its responsibility in the spirit of its best tradition as guardian of the Nation's liberties and one of the coordinate branches of the Federal Government charged with the conduct of foreign affairs. The views of the Members of the Senate have been dictated neither by partisan considerations nor by political opportunism. Party lines have been obliterated. With notable fidelity to their oaths, Senators have shaped their course by the compass of conviction.

I pay this tribute to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle because it is their due. Any man should be proud to serve in the Senate when it conducts itself as it has in this critical hour in the history of our country and of the world.

It is in the same spirit, I hope, that I address myself to a brief discussion of the basic considerations which, as I see the matter, should govern our major decisions with respect to the country's present course. What are those considerations? Certainly they are not to be found in academic discussions of a nonexistent neutrality with a world at war. Neither is it intelligent to quibble over the customs and understandings among peaceful nations which we like to call international law.

When great nations go to war, and desperation drives the participants to disregard the rules and normal relationships of international intercourse, these things fall by the wayside. Treaties become scraps of paper, except as they can be enforced by arms. Neutrality becomes an abstraction. International law gives way to international anarchy. Unhappily, Mr. President, such is the world in which we live.

I do not defend this disregard of morals, treaties, agreements, and understandings which normally govern international relations. I look upon it sorrowfully but realistically. We would all bring about a better order of things if we could. Since we cannot, we must face the facts as they are, and while the spirit of peace takes flight, while reason surrenders to war and the voice of the Prince of Peace is drowned in the roar of guns, take thought for our own safety and welfare.

If we are to be realistic we come down finally to a very simple question: "What course is best for the United States?"

It is from that starting point that I have attempted to formulate my own ideas and reach my own decisions with respect to the pending issue.

I am not concerned with what we may have done or left undone in the past, or with academic considerations of any kind. I am concerned only with our own national life, our own ideals, and our own safety.

What is the best course for the United States in this critical moment?

First of all to keep out of any European war.

Second, with that consideration in mind, so to shape our acts as to reduce to an absolute minimum the chances that we may be dragged into the war, as we were into the World War, by attacks on American ships engaged in carrying supplies to belligerents.

Third, after charting our course by these acts and purposes, to go our own peaceful way both on the high seas and at home, meanwhile strengthening our defenses to the point where no other nation or group of nations may attack us with impunity.

Up to this point I think most Senators will find themselves in substantial agreement with this statement of our purposes.

As to the basic and almost unanimous purpose on the part of Americans to keep out of the war, there can be no question. No true American can possibly wish to send another army of American youth to the bloody battlefields of Europe to try to make the world safe for anything.

We ought to know by this time—and I think we do—that we cannot change the habits of the Old World, which has been going to war since before the dawn of recorded history, over much the same causes.

There is only one solution for Europe's recurrent wars—only one cure, one remedy. It is to be found in the teachings of religion, which, if practically applied to a solution of the social and economic problems of the Old World, offers the only hope of enduring peace among the racially different groups of men who are now crowded into that area of the earth's surface. So long as they have to stay there, or think they do, the only alternative to constantly recurring wars is to learn to get along together and compromise the differences which lead to war. If they themselves cannot do that, there is nothing we can do about it. They have the law and the prophets, and they have also the example of the New World, the peoples of which have for the most part lived peaceably together for more than a century. If those in Europe choose to ignore these things and pay the penalty, it should be their funeral, not ours.

But in trying to keep out of war ourselves we must not rest on wishful thinking. We must work for peace, must ourselves be peaceful, must avoid becoming emotionally aroused by the changing tides of a war which, while confined to the other side of the ocean, is none of our business; and we must not under any circumstances let any European nation or group of nations think we shall eventually come in, as we did in 1917—or, as Field Marshal Goering put it, "The United States will be along later." This time we must keep out—and we shall keep out if we keep our heads and are not attacked by others on our own soil or in our own waters.

Up to this point we can all agree.

I come now to specific applications. Therein lie our differences as Senators and as Americans—differences of view as to the best method of keeping out of the war.

For weeks we have been hearing in this Chamber and on the street corner, in public addresses, and in our mail that this course or that will keep us out of war. The advocates of the cash-and-carry program are convinced that their method is the best. A second group would sell no war materials to France and England but would sell them wheat and cotton, as important in the conduct of the war as steel and powder. Then there is a third group, completely isolationist, which, in effect, would have us tie up our ships at the docks, turn our backs to the rest of the world, build a Chinese wall around the United States, and trade with no one until the war ends.

Let us see how the three programs would work out.

Take program No. 1. The cash-and-carry plan preserves our natural character as a trading nation, but one which, learning its lesson from the last war, will sell its goods only for cash and refuse to embark on credit involvements, knowing that if the war lasts none of the belligerents will be able to pay their debts, even if they should want to do so. Coupled with this provision, in the pending joint resolution is a further requirement that belligerents who wish to buy anything at all in the United States, whether wheat, cotton, airplanes, or steel, shall carry their purchases away in their own ships. It is literally the cash-and-carry principle of the modern grocery store applied to international trade. The ships are the market basket; the seas are the highway. Our goods remain on our shelves until purchasers come for them, pay for them, and take them away. We make no deliveries except across the counter. To say this will get us into war is as senseless as to say that a grocer who sells for cash to the customers who can reach his store will incur the undying enmity of other would-be customers who, unable to reach his place of business because of bad roads, have to trade in some other town. If they are willing to sell to her, Germany can get everything in Russia or Italy she could get here in the United States.

To refuse to sell our goods to France and England because Germany is blocked off from American supplies by the British

fleet would be unreasonable and cowardly, and, by severely restricting our own output of military machines and material, would increase the chance of attack on the United States by nations which are envious of us, coveting our land or our wealth, and which, in many respects, are better prepared for war than we are.

That brings up what, to my mind, is the strongest argument of all for the cash-and-carry program—the obvious contribution to our own national defense. There are two aspects of this problem. One is the wisdom of making it possible for Canada to equip herself for defense against possible attack from overseas, since an attack on Canada would necessarily bring us into the war under the Monroe Doctrine, in defense of American sovereignty and democracy. The other is the vital necessity of expanding our own output of war weapons.

The Canadian problem, in my opinion, is far more important than most Americans realize. At present we can sell planes or any other war weapons to atheistic, communistic Russia, either for the use of the Soviet or for transshipment to Germany, without interference from anyone unless by British warships. If the planes were flown by way of Alaska and Siberia, they could not be stopped. I do not say that we are likely to sell our newer models of planes to the Soviet. I know we have not done so, and feel confident we shall not do so in the future. I say only that the law as it stands permits it, since Russia, technically, is not at war with any other power. Yet the same law prevents us from selling the same planes or any other war weapons—even a coast-defense gun or a rifle or machine gun—to our good neighbor, Canada, with whom we have lived at peace for more than 100 years, with an unfortified 3,000-mile border between us. It does not make sense, nor is it in our own national interest, to retain on the statute books a law which permits us to aid a country whose ideals, as in the case of Russia, are the opposite of our own, and which has its secret agents and propagandists and spies in our midst right now, while denying the same aid to a neighbor we trust, and whom we are obligated in our own interest to defend as we would defend the soil of the United States. We all know that an attack on Canada would violate the Monroe Doctrine, the keystone of our own foreign policy, and force us into war. Yet we all but invite attack, and certainly make it possible, by our present ostrichlike attitude which we are now proposing to correct.

But beyond that, the cash-and-carry program will enable us to expand our production of war weapons at a time when our capacity to turn them out in large quantities on short notice might mean the difference between keeping out of war and getting into it. A Polish officer remarked bitterly after the rape of Poland by Hitler's modern army, "We had to fight tanks with machine guns." It was the superiority of German weapons rather than courage which made it possible for the German forces to conquer Poland in 3 weeks. In these days wars come swiftly, after a long period of preparation, and the nation which is best prepared and has a purpose to serve in going to war strikes first and hardest. In the United States, when thinking of our own safety, as we all are, we need to be concerned only with our ability to equip whatever army and navy we require to defend the country with the weapons they need to fight successfully against possible enemies armed to the teeth. There has never been any question as to the courage of the American soldier. But we must not allow him to be sent into battle, if we ever do go to war, to fight tanks with machine guns, or without an air defense sufficient to keep enemy planes well away from American shores.

Mr. President, it may be well at this point also to recall again that the only distinction between offensive and defensive weapons lies in the use to which they are put. Airplanes are a defense against other planes; tanks against tanks; machine guns against machine guns, and so on. A coast-defense gun can be dismounted and used in an artillery offensive. The same revolver may be used by a robber or by a man defending his home. It is as idle to attempt to distinguish between weapons to be sold under the cash and carry or any other program as to say that one man's fists are serviceable only for aggression and another man's only for defense against aggression.

Under the program proposed, which I intend to support, it seems to me that we serve our own interests as they must be served if we are to make the most of our determination to keep out of the war.

As a final defense against war, we propose to keep our own ships out of the war-carrying trade and also out of the more dangerous war zones, such as those adjacent to the land areas in which war is being waged. In this manner we avoid the pitfall into which we walked in the World War, when the torpedoing of American vessels by German submarines ultimately drew us in. Like every other red-blooded American, I approve and applaud the principle of the freedom of the seas. But, again looking at the problem realistically, we know that in time of war the seas are free only to those who either control them or are willing to fight for the right to use them freely. And I, for one, believe that as between the alternatives of keeping our ships out of the danger zones and going to war, the former is the more prudent, and that the lives of American youth are more important than a little extra trade or the false pride which we would sacrifice in taking this precaution.

I think that is the best answer also to the advocates of program No. 2, who would sell wheat, cotton, and other commodities to belligerents while refusing to sell them gun cotton, planes, and other weapons of war. In these days, when whole nations go to war, and the outcome of conflicts between great powers is determined by food supply no less than powder supply, a ship carrying wheat or cotton is as likely to be torpedoed as one carrying guns or planes.

As to program No. 3. That of the American who asks, "Why do we have to sell anything to anybody? Why can we not shut ourselves up at home and let it go at that?"—the answer is that some trade with other countries is as much a part of our lifeblood as trade among ourselves, the only difference being that domestic trade normally accounts for perhaps from 90 to 93 percent of the total and foreign trade for the remainder. But this relatively small volume of foreign trade, when it does not jeopardize the 90 percent—and that is a very important consideration—is vital. Without it, we would have no silk, no rubber for our automobile tires, no cork, bananas, coconut oil, cocoa, tea, or a hundred other things which we use every day without thought as to where they originate. There would be no breakfast coffee in this Nation of coffee drinkers, consuming the bulk of the world supply. We would have neither tin nor nickel in quantity. Our largest supplies of manganese and tungsten, so necessary in the manufacture of hard steels, come from abroad. Your daily paper is printed on wood pulp imported from Canada or northern Europe. Your clothing and blankets may contain Australian wool. Antimony, the metal from which newspaper type is made, comes to us from China. Mahogany, the favorite wood for furniture, is a foreign product.

In exchange for these and other imports we send the countries which produce them our automobiles, sewing machines, typewriters, machinery of all sorts, our textiles, our shoes, oil, wheat, cotton, and other products of farm and factory. Foreign trade is literally that—trade. It involves the exchange of goods: I repeat, the exchange of goods. It is the only way in which goods can be sold except for cash, and we now have more than half of all of the world's gold stock—billions more than we can use, except as a reserve against possible contingencies in which we may have to use some of it to buy supplies from others if we are ever caught in a jam. Trade takes the ships of the maritime countries to all the seven seas. We intend to keep our own ships on the seas. We propose only to keep them out of the principal danger zones.

To the extreme isolationist, therefore, we must say again: "The facts are against you. We have to trade to some extent with other nations whether we wish to or not."

From every viewpoint, therefore, it seems to me to be a fair assumption that, considering our own security, our own necessities, and our character and purposes as a nation, we are doing the right thing in adopting the cash-and-carry program, safeguarded with restrictions as to travel and the use of American ships.

As for the essential purpose of the legislation, there can be no question. At the very outset, in the language of the joint resolution itself, it is expressly provided that whenever the President or the Congress shall find that there is a state of war between foreign states, and—I stress that all-important word—and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States, or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, then, and for those express purposes, the various provisions of the proposed new law shall take effect. I repeat, for emphasis, the definite requirements which first must obtain are that the action must be necessary to promote the security, preserve the peace, or protect the lives of our citizens.

Even before the President spoke I was strongly inclined to favor revision of the existing law in our own interest, believing the persistent presence of American ships in the dangerous war zones to be an open invitation to trouble. Although for weeks I kept an open mind, taking counsel meanwhile of the citizens of my State and my colleagues in the Senate, I have heard neither facts nor argument to justify any change in my opinion on this subject. I say this with all due respect to the sincerity and ability of the able Senators who have advanced these facts and arguments with such conviction and force.

I have made my own views plain in this brief discussion only for the sake of the Record. I believe we have all made up our minds how we intend to vote. The issues are clear. The alternatives have been fully discussed. Nothing is to be gained by anyone from prolonging the debate. I hope we shall vote and pass the joint resolution speedily, and then adjourn. So shall we serve our country best in this most serious moment.

Mr. BROWN obtained the floor.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BROWN. I will.

Mr. BORAH. The able leader of the majority is not present at this moment, but I desire to make a brief observation. When he made his address yesterday I was absent. I did not know that the majority leader was going to speak or I should have endeavored to be here. I was in conference on the Argentine tariff matter, which concerns my State very much, so I was almost necessarily absent. I certainly should have given myself the pleasure, however, of listening to the able Senator from Kentucky had I known definitely that he was to speak.

In the address of the Senator from Kentucky he referred to me, and to his statement I desire to make a brief reference. He said:

It has not been long since I heard the Senator from Idaho vehemently prophesy that there would be no war in Europe this year—1939.

I do not rise for the purpose of rehabilitating myself in the mind of the able Senator from Kentucky as a prophet but to state that I wish the Senator would state where it was that he heard this prophecy and what it was that was said. I think it was in connection with a conversation with the President of the United States, in the presence of other persons. In the interest of truth, I ask those who state that I made such a statement to state all the facts—what the President said, what took place in the discussion, and what I said.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The substance of what I said yesterday was carried in the press following the conference to which the Senator refers. I had no desire, and have no desire now, to reveal the details of any conversation that occurred. The press, however, carried the statement that the Senator from Idaho had taken the position that he had sources of information in Europe which he thought were as reliable as the sources of information of the State Department with reference to the situation in Europe which indicated that it was headed for trouble which might result in war during September of this year. According to the press, the Senator from Idaho indicated that he had sources of information

which he thought were as reliable as those of the State Department, and that his sources of information indicated that there would be no war; there would be no trouble this year in regard to the European situation.

I do not, of course, attempt to give the details of the conversation, and would not do so; but inasmuch as it got into the press from some source—I do not know from what source, because I never have revealed anything that occurred in that conference—and there was no explanation or denial of what the newspapers carried as to what was said, I thought I was justified in referring to the fact that, as I understood the incident, the Senator from Idaho had predicted, upon the basis of information he received from sources in Europe which he regarded as reliable, that there would be no war and no trouble in Europe justifying any action with respect to the question of our embargo, which was the subject of the conference and the conversation.

Of course, if I misunderstood the Senator from Idaho, I would not willingly do that or misrepresent him; but I did get the distinct impression that the Senator from Idaho took the position that, based upon information which he had, there was no such danger as to make it necessary for Congress to take any action at that time.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the statement to which the Senator refers with reference to the source of my information was wholly disconnected from the question whether or not there would be war. It was upon an entirely different subject. The discussion as to whether or not there would be war grew out of a statement of the President, a conversation in regard to it, and an expression of view upon my part. I do not think it is a very material matter; but, since it has been dignified by a reference to it upon the floor of the Senate, I desire to state that I should be exceedingly pleased to have the entire conversation stated and to have the interview, or whatever it may be called, revealed in full. While I myself do not propose to take the responsibility of revealing all that was said that night, I think those who refer to it in part ought to refer to it in full. That I should be pleased to have done.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President—

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that I do not think a quorum call is necessary. I should prefer to proceed with the Senate as it now is.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator has read my mind. If that is his wish, I will not insist upon a quorum.

Mr. BROWN. I prefer to proceed.

Mr. President, I have waited for some days hoping that a Senator who speaks with greater authority than do I would discuss the astounding statements made over the radio on October 13 by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh respecting the relations between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. Much has been said about his position upon the sale of arms to warring nations and his suggestion of a distinction between offensive and defensive weapons. As a supporter of the Pittman resolution now pending, I am in complete disagreement with him; but that is not the subject of my remarks today.

Mr. President, the border line between the United States and Canada is the longest boundary line between two governments in the world. It extends approximately 3,000 miles, from Passamaquoddy Bay on the northeast Maine coast to Puget Sound at the northwest corner of the State of Washington. It then again extends from the southern limits of Alaska approximately 1,500 miles to the Arctic Ocean. For a century and a quarter no American army has invaded Canada, nor has any Canadian soldier set foot on American soil as a combatant. After almost a century of conflict between our forefathers and the residents of Canada, first as Frenchmen and then as Englishmen, the struggle ceased. It is probable that more American lives have been lost in battle on Canadian soil than on any other foreign soil. Because of the fact that many who clung to the British cause during the American Revolution left the Colonies and went to Canada, bitter animosity arose between the young nation and the Canadian people after the success of our arms in the American Revolution. That animosity had much to do with the War of 1812. But since the treaty of peace concluding that war was signed,

our relations with the Canadian people have not only been unmarked by violence but they have been friendly and cordial.

Perhaps the fact that my own State borders for approximately 700 miles on the Province of Ontario, Canada, including the more populous part of the Dominion, may be reason for my unusual interest in this question. I have lived within 30 miles of the Canadian border all my life. There is much communication between the people of Canada and the people of the United States.

Our athletic teams cross the border, social relations cross the border, and there is much intercommunication between the people. We have, of course, a common language and a common ancestry. We have a common literature and our ideals are much the same as are theirs. Our newspapers, weekly and monthly magazines have wide circulation in Canada. Except for the slender thread which ties Britain and Canada together in a governmental sense, we are much closer to the Canadian people than is England herself.

On October 13 Colonel Lindbergh said:

We must protect our sister American nations from foreign invasion, both for their welfare and our own. But, in turn, they have a duty to us. They should not place us in the position of having to defend them in America while they engage in wars abroad. Can we rightfully permit any country in America to give bases to foreign warships, or to send its army abroad to fight while it remains secure in our protection at home? We desire the utmost friendship with the people of Canada. If their country is ever attacked, our Navy will be defending their seas, our soldiers will fight on their battlefields, our flyers will die in their skies. But have they the right to draw this hemisphere into European war simply because they prefer the crown of England to American independence?

Sooner or later we must demand the freedom of this continent and its surrounding islands from the dictates of European power. American history clearly indicates this need. As long as European powers maintain their influence in our hemisphere, we are likely to find ourselves involved in their troubles, and they will lose no opportunity to involve us.

I call particular attention to this use of language:

Can we rightfully permit any country in America to give bases to foreign warships, or to send its army abroad to fight while it remains secure in our protection at home?

This rhetorical question is a plain statement and has been so taken by the Canadian press as meaning that we cannot permit Canada to give bases to English warships; that we cannot permit Canada to send its army abroad to fight in the British cause. How are we going to do it? Colonel Lindbergh goes on to say:

Sooner or later we must demand the freedom of this continent and its surrounding islands from the dictates of European power.

Clearly this is a plain statement, in this time of war and strife, that Canada must cut the last tie between itself and the mother country. He goes on to say:

American history clearly indicates this need.

When one considers the century of peace between Canada and the United States, it seems to me that the verdict of history is exactly contrary to the conclusion Colonel Lindbergh reaches.

Colonel Lindbergh is a public character in the United States.

We in Michigan honor him. He was born in the metropolitan city of Michigan, the city of Detroit, and his mother still teaches in the public schools of that great city. He is one of the best known men in the English-speaking world, and his words have great weight not only in Canada but in Great Britain and other European countries. It is inevitable that the people of Canada and of Great Britain will feel that what he says represents the views of a considerable section of the American people; and so will Germany.

I rise in the Senate for the purpose of denying that Colonel Lindbergh speaks for America, denying that he speaks for any considerable section of the American people. Unquestionably he bases his remarks upon the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. His reasoning shows that he had this doctrine in mind. It has so been taken by the people of England and by the people of the United States. His suggestions do not carry out the essentials of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine is not a measure which in any way whatsoever fetters the free right of Canada to govern

itself with respect to movements of its armies and the establishment of naval bases. It circumscribes that country in no manner. The Monroe Doctrine is a perfect example of a unilateral doctrine. It relates in its effects solely to the safety of the United States. Its protection to the peoples of the Americas, South and North, is only incidental to the safety of the United States. It extends to them our sympathy and approves of their form of government. It disapproves any attempt on the part of European nations to colonize in the Western Hemisphere. But it does not create or offer an obligation to any other American nation. It is a declaration of independent policy to be interpreted and executed by the sole direction of the nation whose President declared it. President Monroe in first announcing it said:

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers—

Meaning the Holy Alliance, this being uttered in 1823—

to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our people and safety.

It did not imply that we agreed to go to the aid of Latin America or any other pan-American country or colony in the Western Hemisphere.

Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart, who is an authority on the subject, says:

When our Latin American neighbors asked for a more distinct promise of military protection at the Panama Congress of 1826, the United States, in the language of John Quincy Adams, said:

"Our neighbors must protect themselves in case of a fight with European powers. The Monroe Doctrine is only a pledge by the United States to itself."

President Theodore Roosevelt, in speaking of the Doctrine, said:

The Monroe Doctrine is not a question of law at all. It is a question of policy. The Monroe Doctrine may be briefly defined as forbidding European encroachments on American soil. The United States has not the slightest wish to establish a universal protectorate over other American states, or to become responsible for their misdeeds. If one of them becomes involved in an ordinary quarrel with a European power, such quarrel must be settled between them by one of the usual methods.

The Monroe Doctrine was a domestic message to the Congress; foreign governments were not asked to accede to it. It is a one-sided declaration not calling for answer or acknowledgment. No one sums it up better than did the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge while he was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in an article he wrote for Scribners magazine, October 1923, and printed as Senate Document No. 8 of the first session of the Sixty-eighth Congress. He said:

The central dominating fact of the Monroe Doctrine is its declaration of a policy designed to secure for all time the independence of the American continents and thereby the safety of the United States.

Senator Lodge, in a more authoritative way, expressed the views of the Senate, and I think of the people of the United States, when he introduced on August 12, 1912, a resolution relating to the Magdalena Bay incident on the west coast of southern California. The resolution passed the Senate in the following language:

Resolved, That when any harbor or other place in the American continent is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see, without grave concern, the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another government not American as to give that government practical power of control for naval or military purposes.

The Government, in brief, disapproved such action by the Japanese Nation.

Senator Lodge emphasized that the purpose of the doctrine is that of self-preservation, basing his resolution upon the theory that the Japanese settlement of the Magdalena Bay threatened the communications or the safety of the United States. The lodestone of the Monroe Doctrine is the security of the United States.

Now, with respect to Canada, I recognize that President Roosevelt in his speech at Kingston stated that the people

of the United States would not stand idly by and see Canada invaded. That was a statement of the attitude of the United States. It is in no sense a binding obligation. The President accurately stated the feeling of the American people. I applaud and support his view. My point is that this Doctrine is not a treaty; that it is entirely unilateral in its application; that it is not a matter of law but solely a matter of defense policy.

That the Monroe Doctrine does not apply to Canada is apparent. The Doctrine, as announced, states that the American Continents are henceforth—that is, after 1823—not to be considered as subjects for further colonization by European powers. Canada, of course, was in 1823 a colonial possession of the British Empire. Monroe again said, in his announcement of the Doctrine:

With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere (p. 7 of Lodge statement).

It has so been considered throughout the years. Professor Pingrey, an authority upon the subject, whose article appears in Senate Document No. 138, of the Sixty-third Congress, says:

The British possessions in America were not and cannot be included as protected by the Monroe Doctrine (p. 5).

Based upon this premise, that is, that essentially and fundamentally the Monroe Doctrine is a matter of self-preservation and self-protection; and in view of the fact that it is exceedingly doubtful that the Monroe Doctrine was ever intended to apply to Canada, have we any right to inter-meddle in Canadian affairs and attempt to tell them what they may or may not do?

I outline the above at some length to show the utter folly of any contention upon our part that Canada is under any obligation to the United States whatsoever to refrain from aiding her mother country in any manner she may see fit to do so. Colonel Lindbergh says we must protect our sister American nations from foreign invasion both for their welfare and for our own. With his proposition that we must protect our sister American nations for our own welfare, I am in complete agreement as to the present time. But that question must be decided when an incident arises which calls for consideration of its application and must be considered solely from the standpoint of our own protection at that time.

But we leave entirely to the Canadian Government and its people the question of what is for their welfare. One cannot be surprised at the resentment felt and expressed by Canadian and British sources at the statement of a great American citizen that we cannot permit Canada to send an army abroad or that we cannot permit Canada to establish bases for English warships upon her coasts. If Canada does so, and that involves them in trouble with a foreign nation, it is no concern of ours, because we have not agreed to protect Canada from invasion. Canada has not asked it. We have not agreed to do anything. There has been no solemn covenant for help. There is no treaty to that effect. So let it again be stated plainly and noted that should Canada become involved in such manner as to occasion an armed invasion of its soil, the question whether or not the American Nation would then act would be one for determination by us when the occasion arose.

A little contemplation shows the absurdity of the position of Colonel Lindbergh. Suppose Canada, as is the fact, does send an army abroad, and does permit the establishment of a naval base for Great Britain upon her coast, what are we going to do about it? We cannot say to her, "If you send an army to Europe or permit the establishment of a British base upon your soil, we will not help you in the event of foreign invasion. We cannot do that because our purpose in preventing foreign invasion of Canada is as a protection to ourselves and not to Canada. Surely we are not by force going to prevent Canada from sending an army. It is unthinkable that we should do so. Our only course is the obvious and logical one. Let the Government of Canada do as she wishes, and let the question of our aid in repelling a foreign invasion of Canada be decided by us on the basis I have outlined when the occasion arises.

Colonel Lindbergh seems to overlook the relation between the British Crown and Canada as it is today. Britain cannot force Canada to declare war. One of her principal dominions has not declared war. The choice of peace or war is solely the responsibility of the people of Canada, speaking through their parliamentary body. They can go in or they can stay out. They are as free as are we ourselves in that respect.

I see no difference between action by our Government in preventing Canada from going to war and action on the part of the Canadian Government in preventing us from going to war. Americans would have considered it preposterous if Canada had said in 1898:

You must not fight with Spain, because if you do, we may become involved in war with Spain.

This is a matter of external policy for each of these two friendly countries to decide for themselves.

All this leads to the conclusion that in the absence of an agreement upon our part to act, and in view of the unquestioned policy of self-protection on the part of the United States, which is the basis of the Monroe Doctrine, it is entirely wrong for us to deny or attempt to deny the Canadian people the absolute right of complete freedom as to their participation in the present European war. It is no concern of ours, and they are entitled to complete freedom of action.

So, Mr. President, I challenge the statements of Colonel Lindbergh. He speaks with no authority whatsoever but his own. He does not represent the views of any considerable part of the American people. His argument as to the right of the United States to deny Canada control of its affairs, specifically to prevent it from sending an army abroad, to prevent it from building an English naval base on its shores, and his unasked advice that the connection with Great Britain be cut, is not only a gratuitous insult to a sister nation, but it is based on a wholly erroneous concept of our continental American policy.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. Did Colonel Lindbergh indicate what the United States Government should do if the Canadian Government did not accept the advice he would have this Government offer to it—that it sever its relations with Great Britain and conduct its affairs as he would have it conduct them?

Mr. BROWN. He made no suggestion whatsoever along that line.

Mr. BYRNES. How could we force Canada to do our will instead of its own will?

Mr. BROWN. That would be absolutely impossible.

Mr. BYRNES. Could we do it except by sending an army?

Mr. BROWN. Force is the only answer.

Mr. BYRNES. What difference would there be between such action on our part and the action of Hitler and Stalin?

Mr. BROWN. I think they would be identical.

Mr. BYRNES. Does the Senator think this country, in its relations with a nation having a smaller population, would be willing to follow the example of Stalin and Hitler?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly not; and I fail to see how those who characterize themselves as isolationists can in any way approve of the course which Colonel Lindbergh pointed out for the United States to take with respect to Canada.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Probably in all the history of mankind there has never been a more striking demonstration of international friendship than has prevailed for more than a century between Canada and the United States.

Mr. BROWN. I think that is entirely true.

Mr. DAVIS. In these days of tumult and war we have an ever-increasing responsibility to maintain a lively cooperation between these sister states. There is between us a unity of purpose, a solidarity of tradition, and a hope of a better future not found in the case of any other two nations in the

world. Canada is the first country with which we have entered into trade agreements. The second trade agreement has been signed. That shows the spirit of good will and amity existing between the two countries.

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator is correct about that; and I will add to what he has said by pointing out that communication between the United States and Canada is almost as free as is communication between the several States of our Union. If the Senator desired to go from the city of Chicago to the city of Boston or the city of New York and took the New York Central Railroad or the Michigan Central Railroad, he would travel 300 miles through the Province of Ontario in making his journey from Chicago to Boston or Chicago to New York.

Mr. DAVIS. I have made that trip on several occasions. I also wish to add that Canada is the best customer the United States has.

Mr. BROWN. I believe it is.

Mr. President, I think Colonel Lindbergh's remarks are most unfortunate in another respect, that they tend to arouse ill-feeling between two nations which for over a century have dwelt side by side in peace and given the world as fine an example of international good will as the world's history affords. Finally I condemn his remarks, because they lend encouragement to the spirit of nationalistic imperialism which has cursed the world for centuries, and which is the potent poison that has killed peace.

I may add that on the floor of the Senate following the delivery of Colonel Lindbergh's speech came for the first time from a responsible public official the suggestion that the United States should take its sword in hand and go forth and take from a prostrate Britain and France the islands possessed by them in the seas immediately to the south of this country.

Mr. President, I would have Canada, Great Britain, and the world know that Colonel Lindbergh did not speak for America when he spoke over the radio a week ago.

These considerations respecting the relationship of the Dominion of Canada to our own peace and security form the principal reason for my determination to support the pending measure. Expressed in a sentence, I do not want Mr. Hitler to dominate Canada. I do not want him that close to my country. I see no remote probability of an invasion of Canada by any European power; that is not the fear that concerns me. The fate of Canada was but once in its long history determined by events upon her own soil, and even the battle which resulted in French defeat upon the Plains of Abraham, above the rock of Quebec, would not have determined Canada's fate if events in Europe had been more favorable for the French armies than they were. The fate of Canada will not be determined on the banks of the St. Lawrence. The fate of Canada may be determined on the banks of the Rhine. Complete success on the part of Nazi Germany, meaning complete defeat of France and England, could well result in a Hitlerized, nazified Canada. This is the real source of possible danger to us. I think few, if any, American citizens would be pleased to see a Hitler-dominated nation to our north. But such it might well be if the Maginot line were broken, France overrun, and the British fleet sunk or captured by the German nation.

Because we have lived for 125 years in peace with the nation to the north, I feel, regardless of any promises that might be made or any treaties that might be entered into, that our interest indicates that we should continue to have the same neighbor to the north. As the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is interested in the relationship between Mexico and the United States because he lives upon that border, so perhaps I am more interested than is any other Senator, other than my colleague [Mr. VANDENBERG] in the relationship with Canada, which borders my State for 700 miles.

Without consideration of any of the shortcomings which many Americans see in the Hitler type of government, the simple fact that Canada and the United States have dwelt in peace and security for 125 years swings our sentiment in favor of those who seek to maintain the status quo in international affairs. However, we need not be blind in our dis-

cussion to the other side of the argument—the probability of trouble in the event a government operating according to the principles of the Hitler regime should control our neighbor to the north.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the ideals of President Wilson and the principles of his fourteen points were overthrown by the British and French negotiators at the peace of Versailles. I am not unmindful, and I am sure the people of this country are not blind to the fact, that some injustice was done to the German people by the signing of that treaty. We are aware of the fact that the boundary lines of Europe have shifted east and west many times on the blood-soaked French border. It is not surprising that an unjust peace was forced upon Germany. I believe the verdict of history places the blame for the first World War upon the then rulers of Germany. The Allied Powers did not attack. The Central Powers attacked. The Allied Powers did not violate the neutrality of helpless nations. The Central Powers did. Until we have reached a far higher state of morality than the world generally now possesses, it is probable that an unjust peace will be imposed upon a conquered nation that is considered responsible for the breaking of peace. However, it is believed by many that a long stride was taken in the direction of morality and fairness by the magnificent effort President Wilson made to erect a foundation for a just peace in 1918. But he failed, and the reasons are not pertinent to this discussion.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Is it not true that immediately prior to the signing of the Treaty of Versailles—and by "immediately" I mean within a comparatively short time—two other peace pacts were written and signed; one the Treaty of Bucharest, and the other the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. Both of them were dictated treaties.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Both of them were dictated by the victorious Germans at that time, and upon precisely the same sort of basis to which they now object in the dictation of the Treaty of Versailles.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I hope the time will come when a victorious nation, in the dictation and imposition of a peace upon a defeated nation, will be dominated by a man or men who possess the ideals possessed by Woodrow Wilson when he attempted to bring about such a result in 1918. However, I fear that such a situation will not arise out of the present trouble in Europe.

My point is that we, in America, are not unmindful of the aspirations of the German people. I think there was some feeling in the United States on the part of fair-minded men that the Danzig question should have been settled somewhat along the lines suggested in the broken-down parleys of the late days of last August. I think there was considerable feeling among us that Germany was entitled to the return of some of her lost colonies. Although we are not unmindful of the fact that one of the reasons for the failure of the Allied Powers to pay their war debts to us was the failure of Germany to pay its indebtedness to them, there may have been some justification for holding these colonies and for an adjustment of this entire question at a conference table.

Outside the consideration I have heretofore mentioned as to our northern border, there are other potent reasons why predominant American sentiment is not favorable to the German Nation in the present difficulty. American public sentiment is against Germany in this war because the ruler of the German people has seized and throttled democratic government in Germany, and has reorganized a powerful nation, apparently for the purpose of dominating Europe. Our sentiment has risen against him because he has cruelly persecuted a Jewish minority; because he has endeavored to break down religion, attempted to break down the great Christian Church in Germany, Catholic and Protestant alike; because he has mercilessly bombed Polish cities and slaughtered Polish citizens without just cause; because he has devoured the democratic countries to the south of Germany, such as Austria and

Czechoslovakia, against their will. We had something to do with setting up those democracies.

I think no military master or ruler in history has gone as far as has Hitler. He not only aspires to one-man rule, but he dictates his successor. Even the absolute monarch claimed no such power. He was bound by the laws of legitimate inheritance and succession. But Hitler names his successor, and his successor's successor even unto the fourth degree. We condemn him most severely, however, because he has plunged an unwilling world into war, unleashed the most contagious passion known to man, and menaced my sons and yours. This, and much more, is the reason for the dominant anti-Nazi sentiment in America today.

The question then arises: What should we and what can we do about it? Given an undoubted pro-Ally sentiment in America based in part upon the anti-Hitler feeling and the possibility, in the event of victory by the Central Powers, of a change in the control of the Government of Canada, what should we or can we do?

Let me firmly state that I do not think we ought to go to war about it. The danger is too remote, too improbable, too unlikely, to justify participation on our part in the war. I totally and wholly disagree with the oft-expressed opinion of my distinguished colleague, as he expressed it yesterday in a colloquy in the Senate:

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. If it be true that the early victory of the so-called Allies is essential to the security and peace of the United States, as I understand the premise of the able Senator from Vermont to be, then if the lifting of our arms embargo fails to produce that victory, are we not still at the mercy of the vicissitudes of Europe; and by the very nature of the argument are we not then forced to go the rest of the way into the war to help produce the victory which is said to be so essential to our security? May not that be the inevitable, irresistible road to our own participation in the war?

Mr. President, with due respect to Senators who have spoken upon this subject, I think no Senator has packed the essential argument against repeal in as narrow a compass, or has stated it as clearly, as did my colleague in that statement.

I do not go as far as does the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] in the statement which my colleague quoted from him. I do not think it is essential or necessary to the peace and security of the United States for the Allies to win. I put it this way: I think it is better for the peace and security of the people of the United States for the Allies to win; but I do not think it is essential to our peace and security. It is better for the Allies to win because the danger of an unwelcome neighbor in the north of this hemisphere will then be gone. In my judgment, if the Central Powers should win, we could handle the situation so far as the United States is concerned; but the chances of trouble would be greater. First, I think the Allies will win. Second, if they should not, I think there would at least be a negotiated peace which would leave Canada and South America untouched. Third, I think that if Germany should win she could not succeed in dominating Canada and South America. Because of all these considerations I say it is not necessary for us to become involved in war.

Mr. President, frequently American sentiment has been in favor of this nation or that nation in wars in Europe. Frequently victory by one side or the other held a remote possibility of danger to us.

Because danger is now so remote, I say that there is no necessity of our taking up arms, for I do not believe that in the event of success, even complete success, upon the part of Germany she could dominate the North American Continent or the South American Continent.

Will any Senator say that he prefers Hitler as a ruler of Canada to the present democratic government in Canada? I believe there is not a Senator who would not say that he prefers the present Government of Canada. It is possible that Mr. Hitler might take Canada, but the possibility is so remote, so unlikely, that there is no necessity for our intervening in the controversy.

So I say that it is by no means necessary for us to go in. We are not forced to go the rest of the way to help produce a victory, because, while it is a slight threat to our security, it

is not of sufficient importance to justify our intervention. We can stand on the sidelines and cheer. We can supply materials for a price, but the fight is not our fight and the possibility of injury to us is so remote that we need take no active part in it.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President—

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not think Hitler has a "Chinaman's chance" to get into Canada.

Mr. BROWN. I do not, either; that is what I have been saying.

Mr. President, as I have said, the American people have many times had a strong sentiment in favor of one side or the other in foreign wars. My earliest recollection is of the warm sentiment they entertained toward the Boers in the South African war in the early part of the present century. Our prevailing sentiment in the conflict now going on in Asia is well known. It was well known in the Ethiopian crisis, in the Polish-Russian controversy, and in the Finnish-Russian controversy. Our sentiment was not so clearly defined in the Russo-Japanese War or in the earlier Balkan wars, but the fact remains that in all these controversies—I am referring particularly to those of the present century—international law, with one or two exceptions, determined our commercial course as to the selling of arms and ammunition; and in none of them were we brought into conflict, although American public sentiment was very friendly toward some particular combatants. I think it perfectly logical for us, entertaining the sentiments we do, to hope for allied victory in the present war. We have some interest in its outcome, particularly with respect to our neighbor to the north. But that interest, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, is so remote and insufficient that it by no means justifies us in taking any part in the controversy. We could take care of ourselves if Germany should dominate Canada. We could take care of ourselves if Germany should destroy or capture the British Fleet. We could take care of ourselves if the Germanic powers should dominate Europe. We do not want to see any of these things happen; but, in my judgment, none of these considerations are of sufficient force to justify us even in considering entrance into this war. We feel that we are practically immune from the contagion.

But, Mr. President, I see nothing immoral, nothing wrong, nothing tending to involve this country in war, if we hold to a policy with respect to our own trade which has been our universal policy in the past and which has not led us into difficulties. I think it perfectly proper for us in determining our neutrality policy, which has unquestionably been in a state of flux, unfixed and uncertain, consciously to shape it so that those who are able to do so, whoever they may be, may purchase articles produced in the United States.

Heretofore, when military power did not prevent, there has always been trade between nations at war and nations at peace. In both of our wars with England we traded with France and other neutrals as far as we could in view of the British sea power.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not desire to interrupt the trend of the Senator's remarks, if he prefers that I should not do so.

Mr. BROWN. I am very glad to have the Senator interrupt me. The Senator's comments are always very interesting to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator very much. He pointed out a moment ago that, in effect, we are practically immune from the war. In other words, it is left to our choice as to what we shall do. I wanted to invite the Senator's attention to the contention of those who say that to repeal the embargo means war, and have his fine, keen, analytical mind make reply. How could repeal mean war when the nations that would be supposed to make war on us could not, under the circumstances, make war on us even if they wanted to do so, and when a repeal of the embargo would do nothing more than restore to us our rights under international law? The opponents of repeal start out with the hypothesis, the assumption, that the repeal of the embargo means war, and that idea has been so widely broadcast over the country by the

radio, with its throbbing messages, and by the press and from the stump and from the paid lecture platform at so much a throb that many people have been misled into the real, honest belief that repeal of the embargo means that we have gone into the war. Will the Senator please answer that, if it will not interfere with the trend of his argument?

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that no one could express it better than he has just done. The final paragraph of my speech, which, I may say, will be reached very soon, covers precisely the matter to which the Senator refers, and I would prefer to say it in the language that I there chose in the peace and quietude of my office rather than under these circumstances.

I had just said, Mr. President, that in both our wars with England we traded with France and other neutrals insofar as we could. So, too, the Mexican War did not stop us from trading with Europe.

The American Civil War did not prevent the North from trading with England and France and Germany; nor did our Spanish War. In all our wars our trade in all articles continued.

Germany has built a mighty army and a mighty air force and her geographical position enables her navy to control the Baltic Sea. Germany maintains a trade with all the neutrals she can reach. Through her army, the trade routes between Germany and Russia, Rumania, Hungary, Italy, and even Belgium and Holland are kept open. Through her naval control of the Baltic, her trade with Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, and Russia is maintained. From these nations she obtains vital military supplies. But Britain and France, who have spent tremendous sums to control the seas, are, for the first time in history, denied by our law, passed largely because of American public sentiment in the Ethiopian, Spanish, and Chinese difficulties, the opportunity to trade in war implements with us. Is it a neutral position we have taken? No; it is a position which, in fact, gives Germany an unfair advantage over England and France. Germany's Army and Navy keep its trade lanes open. America's neutrality law keeps the French and English trade lanes with America closed. Of that situation, I am satisfied, the American public does not approve.

By returning to the age-old practice of real neutrality, which, in this situation, it must frankly be admitted, will aid the English and French, just as the policy of Sweden, Finland, Russia, and others aids Germany, the American public will then know that we are doing nothing to aid Hitler. Many believe we are doing so now. If our age-old policy of neutrality aids Britain and France, I assert that the great majority of the American people will say that, if it is right for Germany to trade with her neutrals to the North and East, and it is possible for her to carry on such trade because of her Army and Baltic Sea Navy, then it is also right for England and France to trade with their neighbors to the west—a trade made possible not by reason of action of ours but because of their control of the seas. Our present law aids the German Army and her Baltic Navy and, in effect, blots out the power of the French and English Navies.

Mr. President, I believe that the debate in the Senate on the pending joint resolution has been of immense service to the country. I think it has definitely brought the larger issue of war or peace into the open and has revealed the views and sentiments of the American people to be overwhelmingly against war. A release of the Gallup poll taken before the debate revealed that 44 percent of the American people contacted by the poll believed that if the Allies appeared to be losing the United States should go into the war.

This morning's release, as published in the Washington Post, reveals that only 29 percent now so believe, and 71 percent believe that even if the Allies should be losing we ought not to go into the present European war. I believe this is a result of the magnificent arguments that have here been made, showing a unanimity of anti-intervention sentiment on the part of the Congress of the United States.

The President said, in his most famous inaugural speech, that the only thing the American people have to fear is fear itself. I desire to say to the American people—and I think

I speak the voice and the sentiments of the entire American Congress—that the only thing we have to fear is a rise in public sentiment itself for intervention. This Congress will never declare war unless it is compelled to do so by a practically unanimous American public sentiment for it.

But I think, Mr. President, the debate here has definitely shown that the issue in this matter has been stretched too far. I am now reaching the subject the Senator from Texas referred to a few moments ago. The statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that the enactment of the Pittman resolution would be the first step toward war, the statement of my colleague the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], that repeal would be a symbol or a token of war, has been definitely disproved. The issue here is not war or peace. We shall not go to war if we repeal the embargo. We shall not go to war if we retain the embargo. Repeal or no repeal, we shall stay out. We are not threatened with attack. Even if Germany now foolishly desired to provoke the world's most powerful nation by assaulting us, she could not do it. If we go into this war, we shall do so of our own free will. None but the people of the United States will decide that question.

Let us approach this and all like questions with cool reason, knowing that one piece of legislation will not do all the good that its authors claim for it, nor will it do all the damage its opponents charge to it. What we now do, be it right or wrong, will never tear down the firm determination of this Congress and the Nation to keep America at peace.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I present a perfecting amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I also ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PITTMAN was ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PITTMAN to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, viz:

On page 18, line 1, beginning with the word "to", strike out through the word "vessel", in line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(1) to such transportation of mail, personal effects of any individual on any such vessel or aircraft, and necessary supplies for any such vessel or aircraft, or (2) to any other transportation on or over lands bordering on the United States of mail, personal effects of any individual, and necessary supplies for any vehicle used as a means of transportation on or over such lands."

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? I think we should have more of our colleagues here to hear the words of wisdom of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I am not going to take more than 10 or 15 minutes upon one point.

Mr. BURKE. It is all the more important that what the Senator has to say should be heard by the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That is very kind of the Senator. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BURKE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark, Idaho	Herring	Murray
Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Hill	Neely
Austin	Connally	Holman	Norris
Bailey	Danaher	Holt	Nye
Bankhead	Davis	Hughes	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Donahey	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Barkley	Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Bilbo	Ellender	King	Pittman
Borah	Frazier	La Follette	Radcliffe
Bridges	George	Lodge	Reed
Brown	Gerry	Lucas	Reynolds
Bulow	Gibson	Lundeen	Russell
Burke	Gillette	McCarran	Schwartz
Byrd	Green	McKellar	Schwellenbach
Byrnes	Gurney	McNary	Sheppard
Capper	Hale	Maloney	Shipstead
Caraway	Harrison	Mead	Slattery
Chandler	Hatch	Miller	Smathers
Chavez	Hayden	Minton	Stewart

Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Townsend

Truman
Tydings
Vandenberg

Van Nuys
Wagner
Wheeler

White
Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of making an extended speech upon the deep-seated governmental problem now before the United States Senate. I cannot add anything to what has already been said. I doubt that there is a Senator who can make a further contribution to the basic questions involved. It seems to me that all has been said that can be said upon the matter before us. If I debated the question at length, I would consider that I was merely encumbering the RECORD and causing a delay which, it seems to me, would be unjustified at this particular time of the discussion.

I am confident, from the letters I have been receiving during the last 2 or 3 days, that the people of the Nation as a whole fairly well understand what the issues are and have definitely made up their minds in manner similar to that in which the Senators have made up their minds, and they, too, are anxious that the debate close with some dispatch and expedition, and that we soon reach the point where we can read the bill for amendments and discuss some of the amendments which seem necessary and vital to the successful administration of the proposed law.

Mr. President, I rise primarily for the purpose of discussing a point made a few days ago by the able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], when, in his remarks on October 11, he referred to what he called "the effort of the War Department to make the Nation war-minded by preparations for the draft." He stated that "officials are going about the country training draft boards for the purpose of conscripting the youth of our land for military service." He further said that "plans are already far under way for drafting boys 18 years old who have not even had the poor privilege of voting for those who pass the laws and determine the policies which would send them to the shambles." The authority cited for these statements was a rather garbled dispatch appearing in the Washington Post of October 5, 1939, headed "Draft boards to lay plans for M day. Army-Navy selective service committee sets four conferences."

Mr. President, since the speech of the able senior Senator from Missouri, the senior Senator from Illinois has received a number of letters from the mothers of boys of Illinois around the age of 18 years, bitterly complaining about this very thing; and they have a right to complain, assuming the facts as stated by the Senator from Missouri to be correct. But in this short address I challenge the statement of the Senator, and merely do so to demonstrate beyond the question of a doubt how hearsay evidence and rumors which get into these debates, and which are unfounded, create a certain fear and a certain war psychology such as that which exists in the United States at this very moment.

The inference contained in the statement to which I have referred was so misleading that I felt compelled to make an analysis of the situation as it really is with respect to the so-called plan for selective service. I do this primarily because I happen to be at this time a member of the State staff of the Illinois National Guard, and I believe I know what is going on with respect to this phase of the military operations in my section of the country.

Let me state some facts about this matter. In section 5 of the National Defense Act, passed in its amended form on June 4, 1920, the War Department General Staff is directed to prepare plans for the national defense and the use of the military forces for that purpose, both separately and in conjunction with the naval forces, and for the mobilization of the manhood of the Nation.

That was provided in 1920. The National Defense Act was passed because of our experiences in the war of 1917 and 1918, which I shall discuss briefly later.

The War Department would be exceedingly remiss if, in carrying out the directions received from Congress, it did not make exhaustive plans for the procurement of personnel—the

first great need—should this Nation ever become involved in a war.

Shortly after the passage of the National Defense Act of 1920, the War Department began its study of the problem of the recruitment of men in time of emergency. This involved not only a study of recruiting plans, but also a study of the task which would result should the Congress again pass a selective-service law. The story of the World War Selective Draft Act is contained in the hearings held before the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees in April and May 1917, and in the reports of the provost marshal general issued during the war. Those documents indicate how stupendous was the task of setting up an organization to handle registration, classification, and induction of the soldiers required for the war. Below are but a few statistics indicative of what was involved.

The first Selective Draft Act was passed by the Senate on May 17, 1917, and signed by the President on the next day.

On June 5, 1917, all males between the ages of 21 and 31 years of age were registered. To accomplish this, 4,000 registration boards were set up and 125,000 registrars and assistant registrars conducted the registration of 9,586,508 men.

Before any men could be selected for service complete regulations had to be written and issued.

Forty-five million blank forms had to be drawn up, printed, and distributed.

Quotas of men needed had to be computed for every State.

A lottery drawing had to be conducted in Washington to determine the order in which registrants were to be called.

Local boards had to be established, make themselves familiar with the regulations, issue questionnaires, and, based on the answers to those questionnaires, classify the registrants.

Between July 20, 1917, and August 25, 1917, 4,557 local boards heard and disposed of almost 1,000,000 cases.

Not until September 1, 1917, did any men of the initial draft report to camp. Thus we find that after the Congress had decided to use selective service as a method of procuring men 105 days elapsed before any men were available to begin training. Had it not been for the exceedingly able work accomplished by General Crowder, his principal assistant, Gen. Hugh Johnson, and the staff of men and women which they hurriedly assembled, this time would have been much greater.

As a part of its plans for the mobilization of the manpower of the Nation, and based upon the experiences of the World War, the War Department General Staff has, since 1925, carried on a scheme of training a few individuals in the problems connected with the recruitment of large forces. This has been done under the assumption if this Nation should ever go to war in self-defense, every possible day should be saved and every possible mistake and error that can be foreseen should be obviated.

Mr. President, I happen to have personal knowledge of this particular situation, because during the last 5 years the State staff of the Illinois National Guard has done that very thing. This is nothing new. It has not just happened since Germany made war upon Poland. I thought the able Senator from Missouri left that inference, and that is the reason for this full explanation.

I repeat, as a part of its plans for the mobilization of the manpower of the Nation, and based upon the experiences of the World War, the War Department General Staff has, since 1925, carried on a scheme of training a few individuals in the problems connected with the recruitment of large forces. This was done under the assumption that if this Nation should ever go to war to defend itself, every possible day should be saved and every possible mistake and error that could be foreseen should be obviated. To that end a rather small group of Reserve officers and of National Guard State staff officers, who will be involved in the task of procuring personnel, has been given training. The conference at Fort Sheridan, Ill., to which the Senator from Missouri referred, is one of these training periods. It lasted from October 8 through October 21. Assembled there were one or two State

staff officers from each of the States of the Middle West and Reserve officers from that area. Among the subjects taken up at that conference were the following: "The training of State staffs and State departments" and "Classification in the Army."

In other words, a study of the best way to use the men according to their aptitudes, training, and capabilities.

Is there anything wrong about that? Is not that in keeping with the letter and spirit of the National Defense Act, which was passed by Congress in 1920, after our disastrous experience with the Selective Service Act in 1917?

"The recruiting plans of the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Corps Areas and of the ninth naval district." Committees have studied and considered such problems as the type of forms to be used, the problem of preventing the loss of skilled labor, and the problems of National and State headquarters.

The men assembled at this conference were Reserve officers and National Guard officers, who, because of their patriotism and interest in national defense, are willing to give up their own time in an effort to prepare themselves so that they might the more efficiently carry on their duties should it ever become necessary for the Federal Government to call them to active duty. This conference is but one of many which have been held in various sections of the country for the last several years. It has no connection whatsoever with the present war in Europe. Its purpose is not to make the country war-minded, but solely that of carrying on the functions of preparedness, for which we maintain all of our national-defense institutions.

So far as training local draft boards is concerned, it is obviously an impossibility. The War Department has no authority for such training, nor has it the means. That is only a matter for Congress to determine. Should selective service ever become effective, over 5,000 local boards would be required.

With respect to the drafting of boys 18 years old: It should be noted that no selective-service law exists today and none can ever exist without definite, positive action on the part of the Congress. A decision as to whether we shall have selective service and as to what shall be the age limit of those selected would always rest in our hands and not with the War Department. As a matter of fact, if the World War is any precedent, we know that at that time the registration ages were initially 21 to 30. Not until late in 1918, when it appeared possible that the available manpower in those age brackets might become seriously depleted, had other ages even registered, and no one below the age of 21 was inducted.

To sum up, we find that the War Department, acting in compliance with the requirements of the National Defense Act, has carried on for years a study of the problem of mobilizing manpower. This study has involved investigation of our experiences in past wars, of the difficulties encountered, and of the administrative problems that might be met in the future. The training work which it is currently carrying on and has been carrying on for several years is no different in purpose from that training given to its tactical units. Without such preparations our ability to defend ourselves, should we ever become involved in a war, would be seriously affected.

I believe in all sincerity that had the senior Senator from Missouri given that question some thought and consideration he probably would not have taken the press account and given out the statement based upon it, which he did.

Those gentlemen in this work are there for high patriotic reasons, and they should not be condemned but commended for doing their duty. Their motives should not be questioned, especially on the basis of a newspaper article, which is nothing more or less than hearsay evidence in the eyes of the law.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say there is one thing I regret and about which I feel I should speak. Many statements have been made on the floor of the Senate similar to the one made by the senior Senator from Missouri, which have given the country an erroneous impression as to what the Congress of the United States is attempting to do in connection with the present debate. This question affects the general welfare of 130,000,000 people. Their interest in

this debate is our interest. I submit they would be better fortified if we had eliminated a certain amount of emotion, fear, hearsay, speculation, and conjecture. I submit that if in these debates we could have foregone prejudicial and speculative statements, many thousands of Americans would have avoided a severe case of war jitters. What war hysteria there now is in the Nation has been brought about in a great measure through failure of men in high public office to stick to the facts, reason, and cold logic.

At this time I want to commend the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] for the sensible, sane, and dispassionate address made by him yesterday. The Senator in that address impugned the motives or decisions of no Senator in the debate. The Senator submitted facts; he gave cold and hard facts, and from such a premise made an argument which seems to me to be unanswerable. I wish that every man and woman in America who have this war fear existing within them at the present time could read and reread every word of the speech the Senator from Kentucky made.

Mr. President, I deny that we are on the road to war. I submit with all the sincerity I possess that the Pittman joint resolution negates everything that brought us into the war in 1917 and 1918. I submit that the Pittman joint resolution, instead of placing us on the road to war, as has frequently been said on the floor of the Senate, which charge has caused so much excitement throughout the country, is a step toward maintaining peace. No country in all the history of nations has ever made such tremendous sacrifices in the interest of our own national defense and our welfare for the 130,000,000 people as we shall make when we enact the Pittman joint resolution into law.

I submit that this is not our war. We must stay out, and I say that we will stay out because of the sentiment of the American people at the present time. Out of the 100,000 telegrams, postal cards, and letters that have come to my desk, all from Illinois, there are various views expressed as to what should or should not be done with the Embargo Act, but there is not a single letter in which there is the slightest trace of the militaristic spirit that some people would want us to believe exists in this country today. Every single one concludes in one form or another, "Mr. Senator, do what you can to keep us out of war."

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I am interested in the Senator's statement that in the 100,000 letters and telegrams he has received from his own State of Illinois there has not been a single suggestion looking toward the involvement of this country in war, and I would ask the Senator if from any other source—official, semiofficial, private, or whatever it may be—any suggestion has been made to the Senator that this country ought to go to war or ought to permit itself in any way to become involved in the war that is raging in Europe?

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to the question of the able Senator from Nebraska, I will say that I have not had a single communication of any kind or character from anyone in this country that expressed even the slightest hope that this country would be involved in the present European crisis across the sea, and for that reason it is difficult for me to understand the necessity for all of this war talk throughout the country at the present time. I maintain, Mr. President, that only when the sentiment of the American people is changed will this country ever go into war, and, insofar as my section of the country is concerned, that sentiment is 100 percent against involvement in the bloody conflict across the sea.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. Does the Senator mean to say that no munitions manufacturer, no industrialist, no international banker, no one of any kind has directly or indirectly suggested that this country ought to go to war?

Mr. LUCAS. I just told the Senator a moment ago that no one had ever contacted me with suggestions one way or

the other, and consequently that I cannot follow the arguments which are made on the floor of the Senate about the international bankers and the munitions makers wanting this country to go to war to make a few dollars, as has been suggested in debate by some of those who seek to retain the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further in order that there may be no misunderstanding?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. The Senator stated that no one in this country had suggested the possibility or advisability that we do anything which might involve us in war? I know, and we all know, of course, that no one outside of the country has made any such suggestion to the Senator, but I think I should also include that in the question.

Mr. LUCAS. I will make the answer all inclusive, I will say to the Senator. Of course, I am not as closely in touch with governments across the sea as some other Senators seem to be who are discussing this question from time to time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In connection with what has been suggested by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], of course, that suggestion is in refutation of the oft-repeated insinuation or veiled charge by certain Senators and those outside the Chamber that either the munitions makers, the bankers, the propagandists, or the industrialists led us into the World War. Let me remind the Senator that I have often expressed the view that we have wholly repudiated and rejected any such theory. As a matter of fact, the declaration of war in 1917 answered that contention, because we did not declare war. We simply recognized that a state of war existed, that Germany had already made war upon us. To make war on another nation, a nation does not need to come over and bomb the capital of the other nation. It is not necessary that a nation making war upon us come over and batter down the walls of the White House. It is not necessary that the other nation get our Constitution and thrust a bayonet through it. But when it makes war on American citizens, when it destroys the property of American citizens, when it kills our people, it makes war on us. The symbols of America are her citizens and their property. When Germany made war on American citizens she made war on the United States. It was not the munitions makers who touched off the torpedoes from the submarines. It was not the bankers who captained any of the undersea craft. It was not the propagandists who lay in wait and assassinated our citizens on the high seas.

It was the destruction by Germany of American lives and American property on the high seas that took us into the World War. We simply recognized that fact. Under international law every American who goes abroad on a ship in his lawful pursuits is just as much a part of this Nation as he is when he remains at home; and he goes clothed with all the sanctity and protection that the flag gives to any citizen. So when Germany made war on our citizens and on our property on the high seas she was making war on us.

What is making war? It is the destruction by violence of human life or property of another nation.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for again nailing the false claim that the bankers lured us into war, or that the propagandists took the Congress of the United States and the President by the nose and led us into something that we did not want to go into; or that the industrialists, by some sort of pressure or influence, drove us into the World War. The only propagandists, the only munitions makers, the only international bankers who forced the United States into the World War, were the submarines which killed American citizens on the high seas and destroyed American property which was under the protection of our flag and the sanction of international law.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. The purpose of the Pittman joint resolution which is now pending before the Senate is to prevent such circumstances from again arising?

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly. One of the primary objects of the joint resolution is, not to give up any of our rights under international law, but to claim them all, except that, realizing the realities and facing the hard facts, we have provided for the removal of those possibilities and those incidents which might again drag us into war. Under the terms of the joint resolution no German submarine could sink an American vessel because there would not be any American vessels going to belligerent countries. No German submarine could kill an American citizen on his way to a belligerent country, because there would be no American citizens on their way to belligerent countries.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Nebraska for their contributions.

No one who was in the Senate yesterday and who heard the address of the majority leader as he analyzed the very question which was discussed by the Senator from Texas could fail to have been impressed; and a fair, prudent person listening from the gallery must have reached the very definite conclusion, if he was not familiar with what occurred back at that time, that only one thing finally dragged us into the war of 1917 and 1918, and that was the sinking of our vessels, carrying American citizens down to the bottom of the sea. Not only 1, but some 20 American vessels were sunk from the time Germany declared war in 1914 until April 6, 1917, when America declared war on Germany; and 8 additional American ships were attacked and damaged without loss of life. Those were our merchant vessels. In addition, the lives of American citizens were lost upon belligerent vessels. Under international law those Americans at that time had a perfect right to sail the high seas upon those vessels.

As the Senator has well said, the joint resolution, and particularly the cash-and-carry plan, negates every one of the obstacles and perils which brought us into the war of 1917. Certainly if we keep our vessels out of the submarine-infested waters of the Atlantic no one will deny that there will be less chance of our becoming involved. When we look about and see what Germany recently did to two Swedish vessels and one Finnish vessel loaded with wood pulp bound for England, we know exactly what she will sooner or later do to neutral American vessels carrying secondary war supplies to the belligerents if we permit them to sail in those waters.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator mentioned a vessel laden with wood pulp. Submarines also sank a Danish vessel loaded with butter.

Mr. LUCAS. If the war lasts long enough everything under God's shining sun will become contraband in the eyes of the belligerents. Not a single thing will be left that will be classified as noncontraband. Therefore, when we say in the joint resolution that all secondary war supplies, including wheat, cotton, steel, ore, and copper, along with war materials, shall be shipped across the ocean only when the belligerents come to our shores and pay cash and take title to the goods, we send them out into the Atlantic under the responsibility of the belligerents themselves. That is the nub of the joint resolution. In my humble judgment, it will do more to keep us out of war than any piece of legislation that has ever, heretofore, been written. Certainly the Congress of the United States is using the maximum amount of caution in eliminating the probabilities of war in passing this legislation.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me make one statement. I have no interest in France or England. It has been stated upon the floor of the Senate today, at least by inference, that those who vote to repeal the embargo are being controlled by France and England.

Mr. President, I can speak only for myself. I hold no brief for any country across the water, whether it be England, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, or any other nation. Of course, I am not impartial, and no other individual in America is when he knows what is going on over there. However, on the question of neutrality I look only to my America. I shall cast my vote on the joint resolution only from the standpoint of what I conceive to be the best interest of my country, to the end that America will keep the peace,

and that we do not go to war. My conscience will be clear when I cast my vote, and I shall be able to sleep after casting it, because I shall have voted for what I conceive to be a measure for national defense. I shall have done the best I can, with all my limitations, to give the great State of Illinois the best representation I know how to give it in connection with a great measure of this kind involving the peace and the security of 130,000,000 Americans.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Much has been said in this debate about a vote for the repeal of the arms embargo being the first step toward war. Does the Senator from Illinois believe that it is either the first step or any step toward war? And if he did so believe, would he vote for the repeal of the embargo?

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly would not vote for the repeal of the embargo if I believed for one moment that it was a step toward war. Such an assertion has been frequently made; but the conclusion is unjustifiable, and there are no facts upon which the assertion can be based. It is made in the thin air of conjecture and speculation. In the humble opinion of the Senator from Illinois it has done more to create a war hysteria in this country than any other statement that has been made in all the debates.

As the Senator from Michigan a moment ago said, the people of this country have a notion that the moment we repeal the present Neutrality Act we are on the road to war. That is the idea that has been given to them over the radio and through the press as the result of expressions of men in high public office.

Mr. CHANDLER. I may make the observation, if the Senator will allow me, that has been done to an extent that has greatly alarmed the people of the country, and many of them now believe that if the embargo should be repealed it would be the first or some step toward war. Let me ask the Senator a further question: Is it his belief that the present law is an unneutral law and in its application works to the advantage of Germany and against the Allies?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator in answer to that question that I have always contended that what is neutrality today may not be neutrality tomorrow. It depends upon conditions as they develop from time to time throughout the world as well as upon the frailties and irresponsibility of human beings. Of course, the law at the present time on the statute books is for the benefit of Germany. If it should be repealed, such repeal would operate for the benefit of France and England. There can be no question about that.

Mr. CHANDLER. Are not arms and ammunition being sent to neutral countries and thence to belligerents? Have we not at the present time—and I have obtained this idea principally from the very impressive speech of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE]—closed to England and France even the possibility of securing essential war materials and arms from the United States while at the same time we are shipping such arms and materials to neutrals, by whom, in turn, they may be shipped to belligerents? Consequently the present law is working to the advantage of Mr. Hitler and his associates.

Mr. LUCAS. In answer to that question of the Senator from Kentucky, knowing what I do about conditions existing in the Old World, and recalling from the pages of history what has happened there during the course of a thousand years, and especially during the last 5 or 6 years, I do not have much confidence or faith in any of the European nations, whether neutrals or belligerents. I know in my own mind that if tomorrow we should sell under the present law, as we can do, a thousand bombing planes to communistic Russia, Germany would get some of them under the agreement she has with Mr. Stalin.

I know if tomorrow we should sell war supplies to Belgium that England could get a part of those supplies if and when she wanted them.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me ask the Senator, under the circumstances, and taking into account the fact that all of us abhor war and wish devoutly that it be avoided, when we realize that peoples across the sea have been unable to avoid war and are constantly menaced by war, has not the Congress of the United States the right to take into account that, whatever wars they may have, if they must have war, it is our obligation, in the long run of years, to keep it over there, and consequently, if we can, to prevent it coming over here? In doing that we best protect, in my opinion, Mr. President, the safety of the people of America.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the first section of the pending joint resolution has for its avowed purpose the protection and security of the American people as well as our national defense. My vote will be cast upon this question in line with what I believe to be for the best interest of this country and not of any other nation in the world. The present law, when it was passed a few years ago, was a neutrality law at that particular time when applied to all the nations throughout the world; but can anyone say that the law is now operating neutrally upon all nations when at this very moment this country, under the Embargo Act, can sell a Luger gun to Mr. Stalin, and that is considered an act of morality, but if we should sell a similar Luger gun to Mr. Hitler that would be an act of immorality? That is exactly the manner in which the present law operates, and that is one of the reasons why I am for repeal.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator know of any nation in the world, except the United States, which has an embargo at this time on arms, ammunition, and implements of war?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Alabama in reply that I am not aware whether they have or have not, but I can see, understand that, perhaps Finland or Norway, or the other Nordic countries, small as they are, and attempting as best they can to carry on democracy somewhat similar to ours, might be coerced or intimidated to do almost anything when they see the guns of the bear of Russia pointed toward them. When Finland, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, and other small nations, are threatened at this very moment, I can understand that, as a matter of self-defense, they might do the very thing the Senator is talking about; and I can understand that they might do just the opposite, as a matter of self-defense and self-preservation, just as I think the enactment of the pending joint resolution will help us to do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question on that point?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator, of course, has kept in touch with all the developments in the countries surrounding Germany and Russia and England and France in recent months. Has he heard of any threat against any of those countries, including the Scandinavian countries or Switzerland, that they would be forced into war unless they passed an embargo act?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I will say in answer to the Senator from Alabama, that in my humble opinion, that would be the last reason why any of those countries would go to war. I have maintained from the beginning that either the continuation or the repeal of the Arms Embargo Act will not involve us in war. It has been unduly magnified, Mr. President, in the humble judgment of the Senator from Illinois. If the American people at this moment believed sincerely that there was not going to be any war on the part of the United States, arguments over repeal or the retention of the arms embargo would drop out of the picture overnight. If the Senate and House of Representatives, by a concurrent resolution should declare, or the President of the United States should say that, under no circumstances, would troops be sent to Europe in the bloody struggle there raging, arguments for or against the repeal of the arms embargo would

pale into insignificance overnight, and this debate would be concluded in a hurry.

The only question in the minds of the American people at this time is whether or not their sons are going to be sent across the seas to pull the chestnuts of some foreign government out of the international fire. When we get down to cold facts that is the basis of it all. A great number of our people have the erroneous impression that if and when we repeal the embargo we will become involved in the war, and many of the letters and arguments coming from the crossroads in my section of the State of Illinois are based upon that very point.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator is familiar with the history of the World War. Is there anything in it that discloses that a single one of our vessels was sunk on the ground that it was carrying arms, ammunition, and implements of war?

Mr. LUCAS. My recollection is, as I have scanned casually the annotations of the diplomatic correspondence carried on between Secretary Lansing, Secretary Bryan, President Woodrow Wilson, and the German Government, that not a single one of the ships that were sunk was carrying such articles, but they were carrying secondary materials of war, such as wheat, oil, cotton, copper, and similar commodities.

Mr. PITTMAN. As a matter of fact, history discloses that Great Britain captured American vessels, took them into her ports, and kept them there, with their cargoes, an undue length of time, not because they were carrying arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Holland and Sweden, for instance, but because they were carrying, in many cases, wheat and cotton. Wheat and cotton were first called conditional contraband; that is, they were contraband if destined for the army of the enemy. The British captured and confiscated ships carrying contraband; practically everything on the list of commodities was named as contraband; and, eventually, wheat, flour, and cotton were so denominated. They did not try to draw a distinction between arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and other commodities that aided the enemy in winning the war. It will not be found in all the correspondence either with Germany, or with Great Britain, or in the protests which were filed that the seizures were based upon the fact that such ships were carrying arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

Therefore, in the light of the experience of the World War, we would not save a single American vessel either from capture in one case or from sinking in the other case by simply stating to the governments at war that our vessels were not carrying arms, ammunition, or implements of war. The exclusion from their cargoes of arms, ammunition, and implements of war did not save them from destruction during the last war; and taking the experience today of the sinking by Germany of Swedish vessels which were carrying wood, we know that the same course now would not save our ships from being destroyed. If it will not save our ships from being destroyed, how does it help us? How does it keep us at peace? What we want to do is to save the lives of our citizens.

Mind you, it is possible that having proposed a law that our ships shall not be armed, that they shall be identified otherwise than by the American flag—which can be copied by any belligerent—and by identification every time they leave a port, belligerent submarines may be able to come to the surface and, as surface vessels, comply with international law by visit and search, not sinking without notice. If that takes place, what is the result?

A German or a British submarine comes alongside one of our vessels. The vessel is not armed. There is no danger. Men from the submarine go aboard our vessel by means of a small boat. They determine for themselves whether or not the cargo is contraband. They may determine the question wrongly, but they determine it during war; and there is no remedy for a wrong determination except to fight, or wait until the war is over and then go into courts of arbitra-

tion and determine the legal question. But if the belligerents are satisfied that there is no danger to a submarine in visiting and searching a vessel of ours, and they do so and then actually destroy the vessel and its cargo, but, before doing so, make provision for the safety for the lives of our citizens, there is not going to be any cause that will arouse the people of this country to a war fever, and we shall not get into any trouble.

That is the object of the pending legislation. There is today no law on the statute books to prevent an American vessel from carrying anything on earth to a belligerent except a few manufactured articles. We know that our vessels will be stopped. We know that they will be destroyed, if necessary. That is the foundation of the legislation before Congress. The World War demonstrated that keeping off a few manufactured articles would not prevent the sinking of our vessels during that war. The present war demonstrates that the same course will not do it now. It is perfectly apparent.

There is one other matter to which I wish to call the Senator's attention which seems to be misunderstood, not only by the masses of the people of this country but by a great many of the lawyers of this country and by the writers of this country, namely, that the present law does not apply to any country on earth except those which are actually at war. Today no countries are at war except Great Britain, France, and Germany, and Poland, if you wish to say that she is still at war. The present law does not apply to any country except those four. All the arms and ammunition we choose to sell may go to any other country in the world—to Russia, to Rumania, to Yugoslavia, even to Italy. Russia is not at war. Italy is not at war. Rumania is not at war. Yugoslavia is not at war. Arms and ammunition may go to any of them.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] said that arms and ammunition and implements of war should not go to Italy, but the present law does not allow the President to stop them from going to Italy because Italy is not at war. It would be necessary, in order to accomplish that, to amend the present act to make it apply to certain neutrals—what neutrals? Who is to determine what neutrals it shall apply to?

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] suggests that we do not allow anything at all to be shipped to Europe. That might be the safe way, but, if we should do that, what would be the result? Let us get away from Germany. So many people are touchy about Germany. Take the case of Russia. Take the case of Stalin. There is no more brutal conqueror in the world than Stalin. Hitler is a piker beside him. Yet under the law that is on our statute books today, which some desire to repeal, Russia may buy all the arms and ammunition she wants to buy from us because the present law does not apply to Russia. She is not at war. What has she done? She has already bought airplanes from us. She has bought airplane engines from us. She has helped to build up her defense. She has bought our patents; she has obtained licenses under our patents; she has built up one of the greatest war machines in all the world. And here are Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, peaceful little countries, interfering with no one, with no factories to build arms and ammunition and implements of war. Here is Finland in exactly the same fix.

There is Norway, in the same fix. Sweden may have a few factories, though very few by comparison. Yet Russia, when she has taken advantage of our law and built up this great armament and great surplus, may prevent Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden, Holland, Belgium, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia—all of them—from getting a single, solitary airplane; a single, solitary instrument of defense. How? By doing something over which we have no control—by simply bringing about war against those countries. That is what may happen under the present law.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. I am very much indebted to the Senator from Nevada for the contribution made by him. I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, what the Senator from Nevada has said is, of course, thoroughly true. We have been, to a certain ex-

tent, an arsenal for Russia in order that she might better take care of Finland and some of the other Baltic states. It might be well to point out to the Senator what, of course, he already knows—that the great democracy of England, as I understand, has just concluded a written treaty with Mr. Stalin whereby she is about to furnish him with two of the most strategic war materials which she possesses, tin and rubber, which, of course, will go into implements of war and can go into substantially nothing else except that some of them may find their way to Germany for the purpose of carrying out the aims of what I concede to be the greatest conqueror of them all, Mr. Stalin. It seems odd.

We have entered into some kind of an agreement with England to exchange cotton for rubber. I do not know what the status of that agreement is at this time. The Banking and Currency Committee considered it last year. I believe the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] was particularly interested in that agreement. It would be interesting to know whether we are getting that rubber in exchange for cotton, as it was agreed that we should do.

The Senator, however, again raises the question of transshipment. Of course in this joint resolution and in existing law we do everything we can to prevent transshipment.

We create a munitions board, and we make it unlawful for our manufacturers to ship for transshipment. After the goods leave our country, however, we have no control over them. We do everything we can, as long as they are in the United States, to prevent transshipment. Once they get out of our hands, anything may happen.

Ireland is neutral. Ireland has not declared war. Belgium is neutral. Russia is neutral. Italy is neutral, as the Senator well points out; and any of them theoretically may buy our materials, war materials or otherwise, until the new law goes into effect, and transship them. But, as I pointed out to the Senator from Nevada I think a week or so ago, in the World War England put every neutral nation on a quota basis. They now have announced their intention of doing likewise. Of course, that does not justify our allowing transshipments to be made if we can prevent it; but England now has a mission in Sweden working out a quota for Sweden and Norway and the Scandinavian countries based upon their peacetime needs; and they will unquestionably follow, and have announced themselves as going to follow, their former wartime policy of putting neutrals on a quota basis. So, as a matter of practical fact, there will be very little transshipment to Germany; but I still wonder about the good faith of England in asking us at this time to repeal our embargo and then entering into a contract to furnish tin and rubber to Russia.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, let me answer that for just a second.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to know just when England asked us to repeal this embargo, and just what information is coming from England, through whom, and to whom. I have heard the statement made on this floor in the past several days in these debates that England is giving us the sign over here to go; the sign to repeal our Embargo Act. As one of the two Senators from Illinois, who represent 7,800,000 people, I am vitally interested in finding out just where this information is coming from, who is getting the information, and why I have not been invited in on some of these conferences.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the Senator from Idaho answer that question. He made the assertion.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I think, if the Senator from Illinois will recall, a gentleman known as Sir Anthony Eden came over here for a very good purpose. Of course, it is not subject to mathematical proof; but immediately after the boat docked in London he went to No. 10 Downing Street and at least assured certain persons there that he thought the American embargo would be repealed.

Mr. LUCAS. So what? [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. So what? So this, that England and France probably would never have taken the position they

took, if they had not known in advance that there would be an attempt to repeal our present embargo.

Mr. LUCAS. That is another one of those violent conclusions, based upon conjecture and speculation, which has been running rife throughout the country. Mr. HAMILTON FISH, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives and minority leader of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, made a trip into Germany and flew in Ribbentrop's plane all over the country, but I would not say that Congressman FISH is for the continuation of the embargo because he wants to aid Germany.

So we come right back to the one proposition, so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned: What is best for America? England has not contacted me; Germany has not contacted me; France has not contacted me; and no agent of any of those governments which are now at war, nor any agent of any of those nations, has ever said anything to the Senator from Illinois about what he should do. I have never been in a meeting since Congress met for this extraordinary session, with anyone outside of the Senate, either at dinners, or teas, or what not, where any single individual ever approached me for the purpose of attempting to convince me that it was proper for me to vote for repeal of the embargo because it would help England and France.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I had intended. I am like the Swede who proposed to the girl; I have said too much already. [Laughter.] I did not intend to say this much; if I have talked too long the Senator from Nebraska must assume a part of the responsibility, because it was he who started the debate by asking me a question, when I was ready to cease and desist.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. The junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], who I do not think has the very highest admiration for Great Britain, judging by his speech, seems to want us to follow the example of Great Britain. In the first place, Great Britain agreed to trade some rubber with Russia for some wheat. Our Embargo Act does not prevent us during war from selling rubber to Great Britain, does it? Not at all. The things about which Great Britain has entered into an agreement with Russia are not arms, ammunition, and implements of war, which the Senator thinks it is illegal to sell. They are not on our list. We can sell to any warring power any of the articles about which the Senator is talking, because the things in which they are dealing are not what the Senator calls arms, ammunition, and implements of war. But suppose Great Britain were selling arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Russia. Would that justify us in selling arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Great Britain under the Senator's theory? I do not think it would at all.

The Senator is talking about handling those things after they get into a country, and refers to the fact that our law provides that they cannot be sent by transshipment to a belligerent. Yet he is one of the strongest advocates of our not meddling in the affairs of other countries, of our "keeping our nose out of their business." Nevertheless, he would allow arms, ammunition, and implements of war to go to Russia, a country that is larger than the United States, with more boundaries over which to cross into Germany and to other countries than we have here, and after they get them there Germany can obtain them legally. The Senator would attempt to have us apply a spy system there to see whether or not, after the articles got to Russia, they were to be taken into Germany.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. That would not be changed under the so-called Pittman measure, would it?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; because we have no embargo.

The Senator's idea is to have an embargo on four or five things. They can legally be sent to Russia, if they are to stop there, but the Senator would have us go with them to see if they stop there and do not go to Germany. He wants a spy system there, or some little agent down here saying, "I suspect it is going to Russia to be sent to Germany. I suspect it is

going to Yugoslavia to be sent to Germany. I suspect it is going to Rumania to be sent to Germany," and he would stop it, one little man here offending the whole world by meddling in their affairs, attempting to find out, after they legally buy something here, whether at some later time it is to be transferred somewhere else. We would be in more trouble than ever. The Senator would have us go to every neutral country and have a spy system set up to see whether or not, after articles are brought in legally, they are sent illegally to belligerent countries. Talk about sticking your nose into other people's business. If there is a worse example of such a course than that, I do not know what it could be.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not interested in what England did in the last war with respect to quotas; I am not interested in what England and Soviet Russia are doing at the present time with regard to any trade pacts they are completing. I am not interested in what Germany and Italy are doing at this time with respect to pacts into which they are entering. I am not interested in the England-Turkey pact which has just been completed. What I am interested in, if you will indulge me again, is what is best for my country under present world conditions.

When I study the present law from the standpoint of neutrality and find that it is possible to sell to communistic Russia a thousand bombing planes tomorrow, but that we cannot sell to Canada, our peaceful neighbor for over a hundred years, a single pound of powder, I cannot comprehend how anyone can contend that such a law is a law of neutrality, operating fairly and with equity and good conscience upon all nations alike.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Who put the law on the statute books?

Mr. LUCAS. That is not the question.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Who put it there? You put it there. The administration put it there. It is your law. It is on the books. Why are you complaining about it?

Mr. LUCAS. I did not yield for any long dissertation by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The law is the one you made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I understood I had the floor. I did not think the Senator from Minnesota had the floor. If I read the RECORD of a few days ago correctly, I can understand how he would want the floor, because he wants a lot of things; he wants this Nation to take a good portion of the British islands out along the eastern coast of America. He is a peace-loving advocate, one of the great apostles of peace in this country, and I admire him for it. He has done a great work, and has made a great contribution to the cause of peace. I solemnly confess I was startled when I learned that my good friend from Minnesota, this man who loves peace better than he loves anything else, had started out upon a career to get this country into war by seizing these islands belonging to Great Britain. I was shocked; I was surprised; I was chagrined.

Of course, we passed this law; but are we to remain paralyzed and take no steps to protect our national welfare under changed conditions? Has there ever been a law passed in the history of the country that was not amended from time to time in the light of experience?

Oh, Mr. President, I know when the law was passed, I know how it was done. I was a Member of the House of Representatives at that particular time. I voted for it. I remember when we amended the law in the middle of a session in order to capture a few airplanes which were on their way to Spain. That was not changing the rules in the middle of the game; that was just emasculating them completely.

We passed the so-called neutrality law in 1935. Today there is a European war of gigantic proportions in progress. Yet it apparently makes little difference in the estimation of some that that war vitally affects our domestic policy and our national defense. They want that law to remain just as it

is without changing a word in it until the nations across the seas settle their bloody disputes. Whether it takes 6 months or 6 years.

Just imagine adopting a theory of that kind, and contending that that is a theory of national defense, a theory which will protect the welfare of the people of this Nation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator speaks of those who wish to have the present embargo law remain on the books as it is. Is it not inescapable that Senators who desire to retain the present embargo law want to retain it and all of the consequences which flow from it, so eloquently pointed out by the Senator from Illinois, like Russia buying a thousand bombing planes, but Canada not being able to get one? In other words, if they keep the law, then they must hug to their breasts the consequences and effects of the law.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course the Senator from Texas is 100 percent right. He is exactly correct.

I shall not detain the Senate longer, but shall say just one word in conclusion. I again assert that this is not our war; I assert that America should stay out; I repeat that so long as I am a Member of the Senate I will vote, if necessary, billions of dollars for the defense of our shores, but the senior Senator from Illinois will never vote a dime to send American boys across the ocean to pull the chestnuts of some other nation out of the international fire. I make this statement again because I have found, in reading my mail, some who are wont to scoff at this declaration of policy.

Let us stay out, Mr. President, because when this holocaust of hell has been finished across the sea, if European civilization is not destroyed, it will be seriously crippled. The Old World will need America to bind up her wounds and keep civilization from completely collapsing.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement of the President made at the time of the signing of the Neutrality Act of 1935.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

AUGUST 31, 1935.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have given my approval to Senate Joint Resolution 173, the neutrality legislation which passed the Congress last week.

I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end.

It provides for a licensing system for the control of carrying arms, etc., by American vessels, for the control of the use of American waters by foreign submarines; for the restriction of travel by American citizens on vessels of belligerent nations, and for the embargo of the export of arms, etc., to both belligerent nations.

The latter section terminates at the end of February 1936. This section requires further and more complete consideration between now and that date. Here again the objective is wholly good. It is the policy of this Government to avoid being drawn into wars between other nations, but it is a fact that no Congress and no Executive can foresee all possible future situations. History is filled with unforeseeable situations that call for some flexibility of action. It is conceivable that situations may arise in which the wholly inflexible provisions of section 1 of this act might have exactly the opposite effect from that which was intended. In other words, the inflexible provisions might drag us into war instead of keeping us out. The policy of the Government is definitely committed to the maintenance of peace and the avoidance of any entanglements which would lead us into conflict. At the same time it is the policy of the Government by every peaceful means and without entanglement to cooperate with other similarly minded governments to promote peace.

In several aspects further careful consideration of neutrality needs is most desirable and there can well be an expansion to include provisions dealing with other important aspects of our neutrality policy which have not been dealt with in this temporary measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senate that I shall take only about 8 minutes of its time. The majority leader says he will give me 10, but I do not think I shall need so much.

The debate already had upon the measure has so clearly covered every question involved that I have concluded not to

make a speech but simply to announce the reasons why I shall vote for the repeal of the embargo and the existing Neutrality Act and to substitute therefor on the statute books the pending administration measure, known as the Pittman joint resolution.

I am for the repeal of the embargo—

Because I am for peace, first, last, and all the time, and believe that the policy of an embargo is at war with the policy of peace;

Because in our experience with embargoes they have always gotten our Government and our people in trouble;

Because the only real embargo this country ever adopted, the one of 1807 and years following, was largely instrumental in getting us into war with England and came very near to getting us into the war with France.

I am for repeal—

Because an earlier attempt at embargo came near involving us in war during Washington's and Adams' administrations;

Because the embargo of 1807 came very near destroying our merchant marine, and if this embargo is continued it will endanger, cripple, or destroy our present merchant marine.

I am for repeal—

Because the embargo of 1807 impoverished our people on the entire Atlantic seacoast;

Because the embargo of 1807 came exceedingly near to causing the New England States to secede from the Union.

The State of my friend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] was very anxious to secede when that embargo was imposed, and a convention was held in Hartford to discuss the question.

Mr. President, I am for repeal—

Because an embargo is contrary to the processes of peaceful adjustment of differences between nations;

Because I believe that embargoes are injurious alike to the nations against which they are aimed, and more injurious to the nation which enacts the embargoes;

Because I do not desire this war to injure American trade and commerce on the seas any more than necessary in order to preserve our peace.

I am in favor of repeal—

Because the present embargo, while not intended by anyone who voted for it as an aid to an aggressor nation, has in practice been found to aid such aggressor nation, and I do not favor aiding aggressor nations;

Because, while I believe England and France, in repudiating their war debts to us contracted during and after the World War, have failed in their duty to us, and deserve nothing at our hands, on the other hand, Germany also owes us and has not paid us, and I believe that it is unwise for the United States to take part against Great Britain and France in this war and in favor of Hitler. To be specific, the present embargo aids Hitler in his war of aggression upon Poland, France, and Great Britain, and I do not think our people wish to aid him in any such aggressive tactics.

I favor repeal—

Because I do not think anyone in the Congress believed at the time of the passage of the Embargo Act that such would be its effect.

Mr. President, I am almost tempted to propound a question to my distinguished friend across the aisle, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who has had so much to say about embargoes and peace in the last few years. When the Senator voted for the Embargo Act did he believe that it would aid Germany in her campaign of aggression?

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I am delighted the Senator has put that question to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will answer it.

Mr. NYE. When we passed the Arms Embargo and the Neutrality Act I had no means of knowing whom it was going to injure or whom it was going to aid. When Congress passed the Neutrality Act containing the arms embargo that question was not in my mind, nor was it in the mind of any other Senator, nor in the mind of any Representative.

There was only one question, one thought, at that time, and that was, Is not this the best way for the United States

to keep out of other people's wars, whomever it might be aiding, whomever it might be injuring?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, when it is conceded by everyone, including the Members of this body that the embargo helps aggressor Germany, aggressor Hitler, I cannot understand why the Senator from North Dakota is not willing to vote to repeal the embargo, since he admits that at the time of its passage he did not know it would have such an effect as it has had.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I ask the Senator to yield in order to permit me to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question for my information. It has been stated around the lobbies and on the floor of the Senate—and I should like to know whether or not it is a fact—that the Senator from North Dakota advocated raising the embargo in the Spanish civil war situation?

Mr. NYE. It is quite true that I did, Mr. President, and for a very good reason, which I will state, if the Senator will extend to me the privilege.

Mr. MINTON. Yes; let us hear it. I should like to have the Senator from North Dakota, if necessary, take the floor for the remainder of the day to make his explanation.

Mr. NYE. I shall take but 1 minute.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to yield, but I hope Senators will not occupy all the remaining time.

Mr. NYE. I shall reply in only a few words. The embargo against Spain was voted by the United States Congress after war came to Spain. Its repeal under those circumstances was quite different from the repeal which is now being asked.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, its object was to keep us out of war.

Mr. NYE. Who was it that contended that the Spanish arms embargo was needed to keep us out of war?

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, the Senator from North Dakota was managing the embargo campaign at that time. If he does not know—

Mr. NYE. No, Mr. President, the Senator is sadly mistaken.

Mr. McKELLAR. If he does not know anything about it—

Mr. NYE. The Senator who managed the Spanish arms embargo was the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. He pleaded at that time that the imposition of an embargo was the way to keep us out of that Spanish situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was it the purpose of the Senator from North Dakota to get us into the Spanish Civil War when he advocated raising the embargo? I do not know what his purpose was, but at any rate we kept out of that war and retained the embargo.

Mr. President, I am against the present embargo and for the so-called Pittman joint resolution, because the embargo is a distinct aid and help to Hitler in his aggressive war moves in Europe, which war moves I do not desire to see succeed and which will not benefit my country or the rest of mankind, in my judgment.

I advocate repeal of the embargo because it has the effect of aiding nazi-ism and communism, to neither of which "isms" I subscribe, and both of which I abhor.

How Members of this great body can favor the retention of an embargo act which helps nazi-ism and communism I cannot understand.

I shall vote for repeal of the embargo because it operates to injure two of the great democracies of the world, France and England, and I do not think it was intended by Congress in the passage of the embargo to injure those two great democracies, or others to a less degree, in behalf of a totalitarian state led by a wild man.

What are we doing when we defend the present embargo? We are promoting the highest and best interests of this wild man.

Mr. President, I am against the embargo and for the Pittman joint resolution because the embargo in its operation

and effect is not a neutrality law in any possible sense of the word.

I am against the embargo because I believe the Congress made a mistake in passing the Embargo Act, although I was one of those who voted for it. When a mistake of such tremendous importance—in view of subsequent events—is made, it ought to be corrected at the earliest possible moment. After I have made a mistake I am ever willing to correct that mistake.

I am against the embargo, Mr. President, because I think there is no force in the argument that if Congress passed a bad law affecting foreign nations it has no right, immediately or at any time, to repeal that law, whether or not the nations affected by the bad law are at war.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. Does the Senator from Tennessee think we would have done better to take the advice of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who, when we were debating this question in 1935, said:

We must pass it now, in advance of the war, it is said. Not so at all. We would do infinitely a better job if we should wait until the occasion arose and the realities were before us.

That is what the Senator from California said in 1935. I think it was eminently correct then, but that was not what he said today.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was good sense then, and it is good sense now.

Mr. President, I believe it is to the best interests of America and the cause of peace generally to repeal the embargo law. I believe the Embargo Act gave great encouragement to Hitler to proceed in his aggressive steps toward weak and helpless nations, and especially toward Poland.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I am taking more than 8 minutes, but if the Senator is responsible for that I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has just stated that he believes the existence of the Embargo Act encouraged Hitler to go on with his aggressive conquests.

Mr. McKELLAR. I doubt if he would ever have undertaken to overrun Poland if it had not been for his knowledge of the existence of the Embargo Act and the consequences which followed it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The opponents of repeal—notably, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—say that inasmuch as we have made certain promises to Hitler, we must not change the rules during the game. In other words, if Hitler acted upon the assumption that we had the embargo and that it would help him, we have no right, now that he is engaged in his campaign of conquest, to change the law, because we are estopped. We led him into it and encouraged him, and now we must be fair and not repeal it, but must stand hitched and keep our word that we will not allow any of his victims to obtain anything with which to defend themselves.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Texas is probably suspicious that the Senator from Michigan is entirely mistaken in his line of reasoning. I think we have a perfect right to pass the joint resolution. Who would say that Congress, having passed an unfortunate and partial law, has no right to repeal that law at any time?

Again, Mr. President, I am against the embargo because some time ago I read Hitler's book called *Mein Kampf*, and after reading that book I believe it is Hitler's purpose to bring as much of the world as possible under his control during his lifetime. I do not desire to help him in that endeavor. I believe the Embargo Act helps him in his fight on the democracies and in obtaining world control.

Again, Mr. President, I am for repeal of the arms embargo because, instead of the repeal of the Embargo Act being a step toward war, as is so frequently contended, it is a step away from war. I believe that the safeguards in the joint resolution constitute many steps to keep us out of war. I think the embargo is the first step toward war.

Mr. President, I admire and respect the German people. I have frequently visited Germany. I have seen Germans

there, and I have seen them in my country. They are a splendid people, and I have no word of criticism for them. I think the sooner they escape from the domination of a war-crazy dictator, the better it will be for them and the better it will be for the remainder of mankind.

Again, Mr. President, I believe that the more trade and commerce we have with a nation, the less likely we are to get into war with that nation; and for that reason, specifically and generally, I am opposed to the embargo. An embargo tends toward strife and hatred at home and abroad. I wish some Senator would challenge me if my next statement is incorrect.

So far as I have been able to ascertain from reading history, no embargo has ever averted war. I challenge my opponents to cite an instance in which war has ever been avoided by an embargo.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. Has the Senator read the life and letters of Thomas Jefferson? In 1815 he wrote a letter in which he said that if the embargo had been kept 2 months longer we should not have had the War of 1812.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have read what Mr. Jefferson said; but I have also read the history of the embargo which was adopted by the Congress in Mr. Jefferson's administration. I know from the history of that embargo that it was more responsible for the War of 1812 than any other act or factor.

Mr. HOLT. Does the Senator know in what year the embargo was repealed?

Mr. McKELLAR. The embargo was finally repealed in 1811 or 1812.

Mr. HOLT. I think if the Senator will check his history he will find that it was repealed in February 1809.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was amended several times after it was passed. I refer the Senator to the histories. There are plenty of them.

Mr. President, I repeat that so far as I have been able to find no embargo has ever averted a war; and I challenge any Senator to give an example of an embargo which has prevented war. I see my good friend the distinguished and able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] in his seat. The Senator has been talking about peace for the past 6 or 8 years. He has been the most active advocate of peace. Every one is for peace; but probably the Senator from North Dakota has talked more about it than has any other Senator. Can he give an example of any nation which has ever escaped a war by means of an embargo?

Mr. NYE. No; but I can give an example of a nation which got into war because it repealed an embargo.

Mr. McKELLAR. What nation?

Mr. NYE. The nation about which the Senator has been talking, involving the embargo which brought about our war with England in 1812.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator should refresh his memory about the history of that embargo. It impoverished New England, and very nearly took New England out of the Union. Think of New England seceding from the United States because of an embargo! The embargo got us into war, a war we had lost up to the time old Andrew Jackson won it in the Battle of New Orleans, which was after the war was over, although peace had not been formally declared.

Mr. President, I believe in trading with foreign nations and selling them either materials or manufactured goods. Conducted peacefully, it is a natural, normal process of business; and a prohibition against such trading is abnormal, hostile, and strife producing. Why should we keep the embargo? Historically speaking, the only previous time we ever had a real embargo act it brought us into war. Why should we keep the present embargo?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I wish to refer to the question submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT]. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to debate the matter, but I yield for a question.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. The Senator from West Virginia asked the Senator from Tennessee if he was familiar with a letter written by Jefferson in 1815 concerning the embargo of that time. I ask the Senator if he is familiar with the letter written by Jefferson to Madison in March 1808? The embargo was passed in December of 1808.

Mr. McKELLAR. In 1807.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. In 1807; and in March of 1808 Jefferson wrote to Madison saying—I cannot quote the exact words, but saying almost precisely this—that he appreciated that the time would soon come when the oppressions of the embargo would become so great that the people of the United States would prefer war to a continuation of the embargo.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. The Senator indicated that the embargo was repealed in 1809. It is a fact that the embargo was changed in 1809.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was changed several times.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Fourteen months after it was adopted there was so much objection to it that it was necessary to change it. However, there was substituted for it not a complete embargo against all shipping, but embargoes against England and France, the two adversaries. The change to which the Senator referred as coming in 1812 was a deliberate change after our Congress had decided to take the side of France as against England.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall, that was the Nonintercourse Act with those two countries.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, in the first place, I did not say 1812; I said in February 1809.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. That is just where the Senator was wrong. I heard him say 1809.

Mr. HOLT. And I want to say that what the Senator quoted from Jefferson did not suggest that we were in danger of an involvement from without, but we repealed the embargo because of the profit motive from within, and that is why we are repealing this one.

Mr. McKELLAR. We might not have been in danger from forces from without; but, as I remember history—my life does not extend back quite that far—as I remember history, and I think I remember it correctly, we got into an awful war on account of it at that time, and that was a force without, as I understand.

Now, I come to another reason why I shall vote to repeal the present act; and I want Senators to listen to this because the claim is so often made in this debate that it is immoral for us to manufacture and sell to foreign nations arms, ammunition, and implements of war with which to kill people. In answer to that claim, I say it is no more immoral to sell them manufactured arms and implements than it is to sell them the materials which we know at the time are going to be manufactured by the foreign nations into arms, ammunition, and implements of war for precisely the same purpose.

We all know that to be true. It is ridiculous to talk about it being immoral or more immoral to sell manufactured arms, ammunition, and implements of war than it is to sell the materials for manufacturing them.

Mr. President, I believe that the plan to prohibit our ships from going into war zones, prohibiting our citizens from going into war zones, and prohibiting war credits is the most effective means of keeping our country out of war.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOLT. I thought the Senator said a moment ago that the more trade we had with foreign nations, the better off we would be. Does the Senator confine that statement just to war, or to peace, or when?

Mr. McKELLAR. I confine it to nothing. If the Senator has read the history of this country, he knows, or he certainly should know, that the more trade we have with foreign nations, the better off we are; and that is true whether in war or in peace.

Mr. HOLT. Then, why does the Senator say that the embargo stopping war trade would prevent war? It is not consistent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator said he was for the pending joint resolution because it would prevent war trade.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, no!

Mr. HOLT. What did the Senator say?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator misunderstood me. I do not want to take up the time of the Senate with answering questions of that sort. I suggest to the Senator that he read a little of the history of his own country before he asks questions of that kind.

Mr. President, I believe from our experience—and, by the way, experience is the best kind of a teacher—that the present Embargo Act was the first step we took toward war. I am delighted that we are going to reverse that first step. Let us recall that step. Let us take no step that will involve us in war.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in a moment.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I shall never again vote to send our boys into any European war. I so voted in 1917, but I shall never again vote that way. I shall never vote for any war except when another nation attacks us; and a man or a nation that will not fight when attacked is not much of a man and not much of a nation.

In the situation which confronts us in our dealings with other nations I wish to be fair and just to all, but I have but one thought, one purpose, one ambition. That is to serve and protect the best interests of America and Americans, and keep our blessed and beloved and splendid country out of war.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I was about to ask the Senator when he came to the conclusion that the embargo was a step toward war.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it was just after I heard the long argument of the Senator from West Virginia the other day. [Laughter]. I had some suspicion that it was wrong before that time, but after hearing the argument of the Senator from West Virginia in favor of retaining the embargo I entirely changed my mind, and made up my mind that I would give the reasons why I favored repeal.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator has just found it out, then, in the last day or two; has he not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, it was confirmed in the last day or two.

Mr. HOLT. How long has the Senator had the idea that the embargo was bad?

Mr. McKELLAR. After I heard the Senator from West Virginia, it took me about one-half minute to make up my mind that the Senator was wrong, and that the great body of the Senate was right in its determination to enact the so-called Pittman resolution. [Laughter.]

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, October 21, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious and sacrificial God, the fountain of life and the source of all joy, be pleased to accept our deepest gratitude for every gift of Thine. Thou who makest the great world a place of beauty, let Thy silence speak to us. Thy